DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 959 SP 018 782

AUTHOR Turner, Bobbie Porter, Ed.; And Others
TITLE Preparing Regular Educators for New Responsibilities in Educating Handicapped Children. A Guide to Implementation Strategies for Policymakers.
INSTITUTION National Association of State Boards of Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO 451BH00017
PUB DATE 81
GRANT G007801683
NOTE 155p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Education; Attitude Change; Change Strategies; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Mainstreaming; *Program Implementation; School Responsibility; *Statewide Planning; Stress Variables; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This collection of papers addresses significant issues related to the training of general educators to prepare them for the education of handicapped students in regular classrooms. Authors make specific recommendations for policymakers as they consider effective inservice and preservice programs. Papers are presented on the following topics: (1) an overview of special education personnel development for general educators; (2) response of educators to Public Law 94-142; (3) state leadership in educational personnel development; (4) options for action by state board members to improve the preparation of educational personnel; (5) inservice training; (6) preservice training programs for teachers and administrators; (7) comprehensive personnel and program development in exceptional student education through a partnership between institutions of higher education and state boards of education; (8) delivery of quality inservice education; and (9) strategies for overcoming major inservice problems. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED207959

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: SP
EC
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

PREPARING REGULAR EDUCATORS FOR NEW RESPONSIBILITIES IN EDUCATING HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Jul
'81
148
—
5

A Guide to Implementation Strategies for Policymakers

National Association of State Boards of Education
Comprehensive Personnel Preparation for Handicapped Project
Washington, D.C.

SP 018 782

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

National Association of State Boards of Education

William H. Wilken, Executive Director
Phyllis L. Blaunstein, Deputy Executive Director

1981 Board of Directors

Henry E. Pogue, Kentucky
President

Emlyn I. Griffith, New York
Past President

Rosemary K. Clarke, Nevada
President-Elect

Martha W. Wise, Ohio
Vice President

Jack Whiteman, Arizona
Secretary-Treasurer

Joyce Holmes Benjamin, Oregon
Director-at-Large

Henry J. Bromelkamp, Minnesota
Director-at-Large

Joanne T. Goldsmith, Maryland
Director-at-Large

Allix B. James, Virginia
Director-at-Large

Delmar Cobble, Missouri
Central Area Director

Kenneth V. Hilton, Delaware
Northeastern Area Director

Joseph D. Parker, South Carolina
Southeastern Area Director

The publication and dissemination of this monograph were supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Special Education, Division of Personnel Preparation through Grant No. G007801683 (Project No. 451 BH00017). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necesarily reflect the positions or policies of OSE/DPP and no official endorsement should be inferred.

PREPARING
REGULAR EDUCATORS FOR NEW RESPONSIBILITIES IN EDUCATING HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

A Guide to Implementation Strategies for Policymakers

Bobbie Porter Turner, Editor

A Publication of the
National Assoication of State Boards of Education
444 N. Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 526
Washington, D.C. 20001
1981

PREFACE

In the years that have passed since the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142), sweeping changes have been mandated and made throughout our educational system to provide an appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment for all handicapped children. Critical among these changes has been the approach taken to preparing personnel, for certainly it is through the efforts of well trained individuals that the educational needs of handicapped children will best be served. Thus, it is desirable to examine the impact that federal legislation and regulations have had, and further, to extrapolate needs for federal, state and local efforts to prepare personnel in sufficient numbers and with appropriate competencies to affirmatively meet the needs of exceptional learners.

PROGRESS SHOWN BY STATE PLANS

One of the most far-reaching provisions of federal legislation is the requirement that each state and U. S. territory submit a State Plan which sets forth the procedures by which the state or territory will comply with all elements of the law. A prominent section of this state plan, the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development, (CSPD) obliges the state department of education to:

> "set forth a description of programs and procedures for the development and implementation of the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development, which shall include inservice training, to

> insure that all personnel necessary to carry out the intent of the act are appropriately and adequately prepared and trained. . . procedures for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators significant information derived from educational research, demonstration and similar projects and for adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices and materials." Section 121a.380 of the P.L. 94-142 Regulations (Federal Register, August 23, 1977).

The State Plans submitted under this regulation demonstrate that while great strides have been made since P. L. 94-142 was signed into law, much remains to be done. In certain cases personnel reached have exceeded expectations. For example, in the area of regular education inservice, 207 projects have trained approximately 172,000 persons during the 1979-80 project period, while the Division of Personnel Preparation had anticipated the training of only 46,929 persons. This training has encompassed short-term to very intensive year-long sessions, based on determined needs.

Data regarding other personnel indicate that for the beginning of the 1978-79 school year there was a shortage of over 52,000 support personnel. If the requirements of P. L. 94-142 are to be met, a full spectrum of persons in addition to special educators must be trained to maintain handicapped children in the least restrictive environment, as well as state and local education agencies in an active planning process for the establishment of preservice and inservice priorities.

While this mid-decade assessment of the implementation of P. L. 94-142 indicates that great progress has been made in the realization of our national goals for educating handicapped children, it is also true that much more must be done. The strong initiatives which must be taken require that federal, state and local resources and energies be collaboratively expended to ensure the development, maintenance and continuous refinement of both preservice and inservice programming. Only through such collaborative effort and shared determination can we assure appropriate educational services for all of our children.

Jasper Harvey

INTRODUCTION

The enactment of Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act, revolutionized American public education in scope and in concept. Subsequently, handicapped children would be provided free appropriate education with related services, everywhere in the United States, the District of Columbia, and in the Trust Territories.

Meeting the requirements of this law necessarily has increased the responsibilities of regular educators and altered the roles of many special educators.

In order that each student could be challenged by his or her own potential, the least restrictive learning environment was to be determined by professionals and parents, "the significant others", who would construct an individualized education program (I.E.P.). The objective of this concept was to facilitate entry or re-entry into the mainstream of American society. If successful, the process was intended to revolutionize the status of the handicapped in public schools, to provide greater opportunities for achieving the "American Dream."

Somewhere within this changed public education system, many general educators, professionals but often ill-prepared to work with handicapped students, were asking, "Am I prepared to teach all children?" Pressures grew when cries for help were followed with increased personnel training demands. Responses to these demands have included revisions in preservice programs that often require all prospective educators to complete one or more courses that focus on the exceptional child. Additional needs have been identified for greater inservice training efforts to enable general educators to acquire the skills necessary to provide appropriate services to handicapped learners.

This publication addresses some significant issues related to the training of general educators as they prepare for their responsibilities in the education of handicapped learners. Offering a variety of strategies, the contributing authors make specific recommendations for policymakers as they consider effective inservice and preservice training programs for general educators who are preparing for new roles and responsibilities in the education of handicapped youth.

Bobbie Porter Turner
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface iii

Introduction. vii

1. An Overview of Special Education Personnel Development for General Educators
William V. Schipper 3

2. Response of Educators to Public Law 94-142
Nevin Jones 13

3. State Leadership in Educational Personnel Development: What Does It Mean
Carol Lewis 31

4. Options for Action by State Board Members to Improve the Preparation of Educational Personnel
Helen Hartle 47

5. Inservice Training
Philip H. Mann 63

6. Preservice Training Programs for Teachers and Administrators
Catherine Morsink 83

7. Comprehensive Personnel and Program Development in Exceptional Student Education: A Partnership Between Institutions of Higher Education and State Boards of Education
Robert F. Moore 107

8. Delivery of Quality Inservice Education Programs
Patricia P. Kells 116

9. Strategies for Overcoming Major Inservice Problems
Stanley A. Fagen 128

Author Biographies 148

Chapter 1

AN OVERVIEW OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT FOR GENERAL EDUCATORS

by

William V. Schipper

> If it is possible to speak of the genius of a culture or the ends toward which it historically inclines, the genius of American culture might be the idea and ideal of the individual. For us, the worth of the individual is the foundation of value; the well being of the individual is the chief object of social purpose and action.

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142) is the most significant piece of federal education legislation since Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This statute means that: thousands of handicapped children who in the past have been excluded completely from public education, or who have been placed automatically in state residential institutions, now are being placed in public school programs; many children with mild to moderate handicaps who were taught in special classes now are being educated totally or partially in regular clasrooms, and that all special education children and youth, as a matter of public policy, must be provided an appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. Such a serious commitment to educate all of a nation's handicapped individuals is without precedent in history.

THE LAW

Thus "mainstreaming" once was a philosophy or theory on the education of handicapped children, is now national public policy embodied in Section 612 of P.L. 94-142:

> ". . . to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped, and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily." (emphasis added)

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 reaffirms and reinforces this requirement by mandating that recipients of federal financial assistance:

> ". . . shall educate, or shall provide for the education of, each qualified handicapped person in its jurisdication with persons who are not handicapped to the maximum extent appropriate to the needs of the handicapped person. A recipient shall place a handicapped person in the regular educational environment operated by the recipient unless it is demonstrated by the recipient that the education of the person in the regular environment with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily." (Sec. 84-34(a) (emphasis added)

Further, each handicapped child shall also participate in nonacademic and extracurricular services and activities with nonhandicapped peers. These include:

> ". . . counseling services, athletics, transportation, health services, recreational activities, special interest groups or clubs sponsored by the public agency, referrals to agencies which provide assistance to handicapped persons, and employment of students, including both employment by the public agency and assistance in making outside employment available." (Section 121a.306)

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPACT

The full achievement of the concept of least restrictive environment will require fundamental changes in individual and school district practices, including changes in traditional values, organizational structures, personnel roles and decision-making patterns. To illustrate, the following must occur in all school districts in the nation:

- Handicapped children must become the responsibility of all educators, not the sole responsibility of special educators;
- Handicapped children must be viewed as individuals whose differences are enriching;
- School districts must be organized and structured to integrate rather than segregate children with special needs;
- Collaborative planning and shared decision making must occur between parents, teachers and administrators;
- Separate placement judgements must be made for each child based on an analysis of that child's individual needs.

Despite numerous controversies and conflicts between various levels of federal, state and local education agencies the response to the challenge of P.L. 94-142 so far has been dramatic. A recent study concluded that "never have so many local and state agencies done so much with so few federal dollars to implement a federal education mandate". No one, however, assumes that all of the goals of the Act have been met by all state and local education agencies. There remains much to be done.

COMPREHENSIVE PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT

One centrally critical provision that has been barely addressed by most state education agencies is the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD). This P.L. 94-142 provision (Sec. 613(a)(3)) is meant to assure that all handicapped children receive all necessary special education and related services from qualified, appropriately and adequately trained personnel. The long range effectiveness of the Act may rest squarely on how well this provision is working in each state.

If this assumption is true, there may be no greater responsibility of state and local boards of education and their administrative agencies than to achieve systematic and effective preservice and inservice training systems. Such programs must assure that the necessary number and types of personnel for educating the handicapped are available, and that they are adequately equipped with the necessary attitudes, skills and resources to achieve the intent of the Act, so that each child may be provided an appropriate educational program designed to meet his or her unique needs.

The following are illustrations of the Congressional rationale behind requiring all participating states to implement CSPD and of the distance the nation must yet travel in order to achieve the CSPD objectives:

- All handicapped children must be placed in the "least restrictive environment". At least two-thirds of the nearly four million handicapped children served in 1980 received at least part of their instruction in regular classrooms. Most of their teachers had little or no training in special education.
- There are few training programs in the nation for teachers of severely handicapped children and youth. It is critical that teachers be trained to serve this population since the Act places the highest priority on these individuals. Programs for the severely handicapped are new endeavors for many state and local education agencies.
- There are few training programs for teachers of preschool handicapped children. Many states have moved or are moving to provide public school programs for these children.
- Inservice training of practicing educators in the new roles under P.L. 94-142 is a necessity if state and local agencies are to provide a full continuum of alternative placements to all handicapped students.

- Approximately one-third of the teachers employed until 1975 by local school districts to teach the handicapped were not trained as special educators.
- The supply of special education teachers is far short of the demand. Data provided by state education agencies indicate the difference to be as great as 64,000. Certain states do not have a single in-state teacher preparation program for certain handicapping conditions (e.g., deaf, blind). The rate of production for all new special education teachers was estimated to be 20,000 per year in 1980.

There is no category in which supply exceeds demand in every state. Nationwide, the most severe shortages at the elementary level seem to be in emotional disturbance, learning disabilities, speech impaired, and severely handicapped areas. At the secondary level, the most severe shortages appear to be in emotional disturbance, learning disabilities, and vocational special education. There are also new demands for special education personnel in related service areas, notably school psychology and occupational therapy. A nationwide survey (Grosenick and Huntee, 1981) indicates that the current workforce of teachers in ED/BD is only 60-75 percent of the number needed, and that each year there is a 25-40 percent teacher shortage in ED/BD.

- The rate of attrition, due to burnout and other factors, is extremely high among special education teachers. Algozzine (1981) summarized the burnout problem indicating that six percent of the nation's 250,000 special education teachers burn out each year. He cited "emotional exhaustion" and stress over inability to meet job expectations as major factors in teacher burnout.

  The highest rate of attrition was found in teachers of the emotionally disturbed or behaviorally disordered: it was 21 percent during the first year, and by the end of the fifth year this workforce had lost 53 percent of the teachers originally employed.

- School principals, counselors and psychologists, have new and important roles and responsibilities for handicapped children as a result of P.L. 94-142; state and local education agencies must devise efficient ways to inform them of these changes.

It is clear that until appropriate manpower training systems are in place and personnel shortages no longer exist, the goals of P.L. 94-142 cannot be achieved. The negative consequences are obvious. The CSPD provision of P.L. 94-142 offers at least two tremendous opportunities. No other federal statute has ever provided for the internal growth of a delivery system to keep pace with mandated changes. There is also an opportunity to "turn around" the general status of educational inservice training in the U.S. which has been characterized as:

> ". . . the slum of American education--disadvantaged; poverty-stricken; neglected; psychologically isolated; riddled with expectation, borken promises, and conflict."

There have been numerous innovative responses to CSPD since the implementation of P.L. 94-142. Almost all states now have statewide manpower planning committees for special education; 15 states now require or plan to require local education agencies to expend a percentage of federal flow-through-funds on inservice training; and there has been a trend in the states to increase special education course requirements for certification of regular education personnel. For example, since 1977, 40 percent of the states increased special education course requirements for regular teachers, 18% of them increased requirements for principals, and 15 percent of the states increased requirements for nonspecial education administrative staff.

While the requirements for personnel development are extensive, the CSPD requirements provide a vehicle to plan for change. State and local education agencies now have the opportunity to redirect or assist in the creation of new teacher training programs, to provide mechanisms to assure organizational effectiveness and renewal, to provide for smooth and harmonious transactions during a period of mandatory systems change, and even to address the developing problem of teacher and administrator "burnout" which has gained so much attention.

REFERENCES

Blaschke, C. L., Case Study of the Implementation of P.L. 94-142. Washington, D.C.: Education Turnkey Systems, May, 1979.

Progress Toward A Free Appropriate Public Education: A Report to Congress on the Implementation of P.L. 94-142. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, USDE, January, 1979.

Mann, P. H., (Ed). Shared Responsibility for Handicapped Students. Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Training and Technical Assistance Center, 1976.

Higgins, S. T. and Ross, J. W., Policy Options Regarding Information Supplied to Decision Makers to Determine the Least Restritive Environment Appropriate for Each Handicapped Child, Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1979.

Burrello, L. C., Strout T. and Siantz, J. E., A national initiative: Training all educators to better serve handicapped children. Education Unlimited, June, 1979, 36-40.

Vlasak, J., Mainstreaming handicapped children: The underlying legal concept. Journal of School Health, May, 1980.

Gregg, T. and Rodman, L. D., Professional Staff Development in State Education Agencies. Madison, Wisconsin: 1973.

Galloway, J. R., Norman, M. E. and Schipper W. V., Education for all handicapped children: Pesent and future. Education Unlimited, December 1979.

Chapter 2
RESPONSE OF EDUCATORS TO PUBLIC LAW 94-142

by

Nevin Jones

BACKGROUND

The advent of Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, very well may be the most profound and far-reaching legislative mandate affecting education ever offered. The philosophy that public schools have a legal and moral responsibility to provide an appropriate education for all children is now public law. A great number of human and financial resources have been committed to implement that law, and many children previously unserved now receive services. Yet history probably will show that during this time only the surface had been scratched. The full impact of the law upon state and local education agencies will be felt for sometime.

IMPACT

The challenges to be faced in developing responsive and comprehensive special education programs consistent with legal requirements have almost seemed overwhelming. It is estimated that approximately 30 percent of nearly eight million handicapped children in the United States will be assigned to regular classroom teachers for at least a portion of the school day. Potentially, almost all classroom teachers and administrators will be affected by the law. This increased realization has caused more discussion, uncertainty, frustration, self-evaluation of personal competencies, and recognition of the need to re-evaluate and re-diret educational programs and procedures than perhaps any other single event affecting educators in many years. Increased efforts by organizations of professional educators to obtain reduced class size and released time for planning, and the increased administrative demands placed on teachers, appropriate staff development programs, and paraprofessional staff assistance, are indicators of the law's impact.

The degree to which an instructional program is successful depends upon the ability of personnel with program responsibility to implement it properly. This may be a more significant factor in actualizing mandates of Public Law 94-142 than any other American instructional challenge. The competencies required to individualize educational programs, the placement of students in the least restrictive environment, and the provision of procedural safeguards will require major changes in the organization and delivery of services. Local school systems, with assistance from both state and federal levels, must address this problem if programs and procedures are to be implemented that will ensure the availability of an appropriate education for all handicapped students.

The importance of the classroom teacher's role in providing a full educational program of services for handicapped students cannot be overemphasized. Similarly, the local school administrator must be able to lead and coordinate the efforts of his or her instructional staff. Program success may depend upon it.

Therefore, it is imperative that the concerns of administrators and teachers be addressed and the knowledge and skills needed be assessed in a concerted effort to meet these needs. Failure, by those in decision-making positions, to recognize this obligation and to take appropriate action will result in the continued uneasiness of personnel upon whom program success depends, a sub-par program, and few alternatives to meet the needs of students with learning and behavior problems.

The response of regular classroom teachers and administrators to the law and to the concept of mainstreaming, in particular, has been to develop a positive attitude. Because educators tend to accept new ideas slowly, the full impact of the least restrictive environment mandate of Public Law 94-142 is being felt only gradually.

Until recently educating the more severely handicapped was not considered to be the responsibility of the public school. Attitudes toward the less severely handicapped enrolled in public schools were reflected in such unfortunate actions as: doing what little could be done for them in a traditional setting, keeping them out of trouble, and expecting them to drop out of school as soon as they met compulsory attendance requirements. About the only deviations were individual administrators or teachers who, on their own initiative, attempted to vary the programs of these youngsters.

Next, the educational needs of handicapped students enrolled in the public schools were provided for by specially trained teachers, usually in self-contained classrooms that were isolated often from those of regular educators. The handicapped child was not the responsibility of one another's expertise, and they made little attempt to understand their respective disciplines. Now they are forced to work together more closely and to share expertise.

ADMINISTRATORS

Administrators and regular teachers with this kind of experiential background have made significant adjustments in their thinking and instructional procedures since 1975. However, teacher training institutions have not made timely revisions in their programs to prepare new teachers adequately to face these challenges. Efforts to acquaint regular teachers and administrators with the philosophy and provisions of the law have left much to be desired, and have engendered uncertainty and frustration. Thus, total acceptance and understanding of the mainstreaming concept has been slow to develop.

Professional educators always have faced challenges and they will meet this one, given proper support and assistance. Most would agree that all youngsters should be given the opportunity to receive an education commensurate with their abilities. The acceptance of this responsibility is rapidly approaching reality, but there are some legitimate concerns that must be addressed before regular educators will feel secure in their ability to carry it out.

The mandated program objectives and procedures of Public Law 94-142 have had an impact on nearly every phase of an administrator's responsibility. Their concerns ought not be understated, and can be grouped into three general categories: (1) concerns about their own background, training and experience in this area; (2) legal concerns; and (3) program and staff leadership and coordination.

Training and Experience

Most of today's regular school administrators have had little training or experience with education of handicapped students. Formal courses in university preparation programs have been practically nonexistent until recent years, and still are limited in scope. A few administrators, either those new to the field or those fulfilling requirements to upgrade or renew their licenses, are receiving this type of training. In Georgia, for example, recent legislative action mandates that at least one course in education of the handicapped be included in the programs of teachers and administrators who fall into the aforementioned categories.

In general, most administrators have learned on their own or through staff development programs at the local level. Comprehensive staff development programs designed to address the assessed needs of targeted administrators are probably the best and quickest solutions to the problem. Few such programs have been planned and financed adequately to ~~date.~~ A survey, conducted jointly by the National

Education Association and the Georgia Association of Educators in the spring of 1980, revealed that 80 percent of the administrators queried felt an ongoing in-service program on the education of handicapped students would be a highly desirable activity. However, the same survey revealed that 42 percent of the administrators believed this need either was not being met at all or only to a limited degree.

The role of an administrator carries with it leadership responsibility. As a rule, teachers follow the administrator's lead. If the administrator is prepared inadequately to provide leadership and support, the entire program and all who are involved may suffer. Feeling the lack of adequate preparation and knowledge about the education of the handicapped, as mandated by Public Law 94-142, leaves administrators feeling insecure.

Legal Concerns

The potential for litigation on issues related to education of the handicapped is a constant concern of administrators. As parents of handicapped children become more aware of the provisions of the law, and as advocacy groups become more influential, this matter takes on greater significance.

An administrator constantly must be concerned about procedural safeguards for handicapped students and their parents or guardians, including:

- Initial screening and evaluation;
- Proper development of Individualized Education Plans Programs (IEP's);
- Monitoring assignment of students to assure proper placement;
- Labeling of students;
- Re-evaluation and re-assignment;
- Parent involvement in educational planning;
- Ability and willingness of staff to set up and maintain the program agreed upon for the student;
- Provision of appropriate materials, equipment, and facilities
- Proper record keeping and documentation; and
- Proper security of records.

As an administrator considers the possible legal ramifications of decisions to provide a program for the handicapped, it is apparent that his or her role takes on a whole new dimension.

Program and Staff Leadership and Coordination

The degree to which a program for the handicapped student is successful depends upon how well it is implemented. Obviously, this will be determined largely by the staff assigned. The most important administrative role is leadership in program development, implementation, and staff coordination. Public Law 94-142 has necessitated a role redefinition for the administrator and, consequently, resulted in a host of new concerns centering on:

- Adequate knowledge about appropriate programs for children with learning and behavior problems;
- Ability to evaluate teacher effectiveness in providing for the mainstreamed student, while concomitantly not diminishing the quality of the regular student's program;
- Knowledge of auxiliary services available to complement and support the school program;
- Coordination of efforts by special educators and regular teachers to try to reach maximum effectiveness in program implementation;
- Ability to interpret programs to parents of handicapped students;
- Development and maintenance of a positive attitude toward handicapped students by the staff and regular students;
- Means to compensate regular teachers for the extra time required to handle the paperwork, planning, and individualization of instruction brought about by the mainstreamed handicapped student.

The success or failure of an instructional program lies ultimately in the hands of the classroom teacher. Yet the teacher's ability to be successful is greatly dependent upon the knowledge, skills, leadership, ability, and attitudes of the administrator, particularly at the building level. Public Law 94-142 has brought a new awareness of the administrator's leadership role and need for new and strengthened skills and knowledge.

If administrators are to have confidence in their leadership ability to implement provisions of the law, they first must possess a working knowledge of those legal provisions, including the concept of least restrictive environment, due process procedures, Individualized Education Plans/Programs development and implementation. For example:

- Administrator must be able to develop cooperation and coordination between special educators and regular teachers;
- They must possess sufficient knowledge of the special needs of handicapped students to exert leadership and help teachers modify programs to meet these needs;
- The need for knowledge of more precise evaluation techniques and assessment skills has taken on added significance as administrators identify and plan for handicapped children;
- Administrators must assist teachers develop positive attitudes toward the handicapped and alternative approaches to working with children who have learning and behavior problems;
- Knowledge of the services available from agencies in the community and the ability to work well with other service providers will be an asset to all administrators;
- The ability of administrators to assist staff with retraining and development of new skills and knowledge through staff development activities may be the single most important factor in program improvement for the handicapped in the school.

TEACHERS

Major Concerns

Just as implementation of the Public Law 94-142 provisions has created concerns among administrators, so has it among regular classroom teachers. Those with several years of teaching experience have been forced to re-evaluate their instructional approaches. Increased stress, or burnout, is becoming a significant factor in teacher performance, and the frustrations and uncertainties caused by these new responsibilities is a contributing factor. Some of these concerns include the following:

- Regular teachers, like administrators, worry about the potential for litigation based on their performance level in providing an appropriate education for handicapped students. The NEA/GAE Survey showed that almost half of the regular classroom teachers surveyed (46.6 percent) thought they were insufficiently knowledgeable about the law's effects on them. In another survey, conducted by the Nebraska State Education Association in 1979, 52 percent of teachers surveyed revealed the belief that they lacked sufficient information about Public Law 94-142. Responses to other specific survey questions related to knowledge of the law, showed similar results.
- The lack of skills needed to create more individualized or personalized programs for handicapped students in regular classroom settings, is of great concern to regular teachers.

- Teachers feel they lack professional knowledge about handicapped children. This ranked number one, out of ten concerns rated by 500 teachers in a Georgia school system.
- Insufficient time to individualize instruction for handicapped students assigned to regular classrooms and increased paperwork requirements are problems for teachers especially if the number of regular students assigned to the teacher is not adjusted.
- The relative inexperience of most classroom teachers in coordinating their efforts with other professionals, such as special educators, psychologists, or social workers creates some uncertainty.
- As parents of handicapped children become more aware of Public Law 94-142 provisions, and of what they legally may expect of a school in educating their children, interacting with parents becomes an increasing concern of teachers.
- An accurate evaluation of appropriate student progress, always a problem for a teacher, is of particular concern with handicapped children.
- Classroom management, especially those where students with behavior problems are assigned, presents a challenge to the regular teacher in the mainstreaming environment.

These represent some significant issues that regular teachers face as they try to provide adequately for the handicapped students assigned to their regular classrooms, while also trying not to neglect the other students.

Needs

Studies, needs assessments, and observations reveal that regular teachers believe they need additional knowledge and skills to feel secure in their abilities to cope with handicapped students. Most of these needs are implied in the concerns mentioned above. Among the most significant are:

1. As a starting point, a teachers need to have a general working knowledge of Public Law 94-142, including philosophy, objectives, concepts, and specific provisions likely to affect them. Some data indicate that regular teachers generally are not knowledgeable about the law.
2. Most regular teachers have not had the training necessary to deal effectively with a handicapped child. Skills that need to be developed or upgraded include:
    a. a common core of skills aspproriate for handling children with a wide range of behaviors and abilities;
    b. assessment and evaluation skills and techniques;
    c. ability to use psychoeducational reports;
    d. diagnostic and remediation skills;

e. increased ability to individualize instruction;

f. ability to make better use of instructional alternatives;

g. better understanding of the roles of other service team members including special educators and auxiliary personnel from within the school and outside agencies, and development of a cooperative working relationship with them;

h. better skills in behavior management.

3. If teachers are to be effective as instructors of the handicapped, they need at least a general knowledge of the nature and implications of the various handicapping conditions which exist among students assigned to their classes.

The magnitude of skills and knowledge needed by teachers in order to feel confident of their abilities to deal with handicapped children is alarming. The fact is that most regular classroom teachers have had only limited training at best in these areas. The full impact of Public Law 94-142 is yet to be felt.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The importance of sound philosophy, well-stated objectives, and appropriate implementation guidelines cannot be overlooked in providing an appropriate program for a handicapped child. However, in the final analysis, all will prove meaningless unless the human factor is considered. The key to success in educating handicapped students in the least restrictive environment lies in the cooperative efforts of administrators, regular classroom teachers, special educators, and auxiliary personnel.

The local school administrator must possess the knowledge and skills to perform as the school's instructional leader. The coordination of staff efforts and the maximum utilization of combined expertise largely will be dependent upon the initiative exerted by the administrator. Most administrators have not had the necessary training or experience to function adequately in the education of exceptional children. Furthermore, regular classroom teachers, particularly those with several years of experience, are not prepared to adapt curriculum and instructional techniques to meet the needs of students with learning and behavior problems.

A team approach between regular classroom teachers and special educators should be developed. Barriers between regular and special educators, partially carried over from the pre-mainstreaming era, and partially due to hesitancy on the part of some regular educators to accept the mainstreaming concept, continue to present problems in the education of handicapped children in the least restrictive environment. Both groups need to interact more effectively and to be more receptive to each other.

Inadequate consideration has been given to adjustment in class size, teaching load, provision of planning time, need for paraprofessional assistance, and increased paperwork necessary to support the effective and efficient performance of regular classroom teachers, who have handicapped children mainstreamed into their classrooms. Available instructional time is limited. Added responsibilities resulting from the assignment of handicapped students is likely to reduce time for regular students if some compensatory measures are not taken.

There has been a lack of concerned effort to provide staff development programs for administrators and regular classroom teachers. Where such programs have existed, they seem to be ill-planned frequently and do not address the assessed needs of the personnel they are designed to reach. The following are recommendations to be considered:

Recommendations

A. Substantially increase funding of staff development programs for regular educators, administrators, and auxiliary personnel based on the assessed needs of these personnel in the environments in which they function. This is the single most important factor in making a significant difference in the quality of services provided to exceptional children. Attention and support given to the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development, as required under Public Law 94-142, has been totally inadequate in most instances.

1. Financial support should be shared by federal, state, and local agencies, but planned and implemented at the local level within general guidelines.
2. It should provide alternatives to formal credit courses on college campuses, such as credit courses in a local setting.
3. Incentives should be provided to encourage participation, including released time, salary modification, license renewal and/or upgrading, tuition grants where applicable, or even extension of the contract year, with pay, specifically for the purpose of staff development.
4. Staff development should include, but not be limited necessarily to:
    a. knowledge and skill development for administrators to help them become effective leaders in planning and implementing programs for exceptional children.
    b. knowledge and skill development for regular teachers to improve their ability to adapt curriculum and instructional techniques to meet the needs of exceptional children, to use appropriate diagnostic skills, and to apply fair and equitable evaluation standards and methods.
    c. development of a better understanding of the various classes of handicapped children, the least restrictive environment concept, and the role of various educational personnel involved.

B. Increase the quantity and quality of preservice courses about the handicapped child offered to prospective regular teachers in teacher training programs.

C. Provide appropriate paraprofessional assistance for the regular teacher with handicapped students assigned to the class to permit for:

   1. more individualized personalized instruction,
   2. planning time,
   3. consultation with special educators and other personnel involved,
   4. staffings,
   5. parent conferences.

D. Explore ways to reduce the amount of time-consuming and burdensome paperwork required of regular and special educators.

The list of recommendations is limitless and will vary according to the status of the law's implementation within a particular school district. However, one common factor does exist. All school districts now not only have the moral but also the legal responsibility to provide an appropriate education for all children. The degree to which this responsibility is met ultimately will depend upon the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes of teachers, administrators, and policy-makers in the nation's schools, and upon the commitment of various levels of government to provide the necessary financial support.

Chapter 3

STATE LEADERHSIP IN EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT: WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

by

Carol Lewis

What do we mean when we say that the state board of education and state education agency should take a leadership role in the planning and delivery of professional development programs?

ACTIVITIES

It is somewhat presumptuous to try to answer this question in ways that are applicable to all states. Yet an understanding of the problems encountered in local district staff development activities suggests that the state board and state education agency (SEA) can provide leadership by:

- Sharing information on a variety of approaches to the identification of needs;
- Compiling and sharing needs assessment data with agencies, institutions and individuals that have resources which might be used to meet those needs;
- "Spotlighting" exemplary programs; offering training that increases awareness of the characteristics and components of quality staff development programs;
- Supporting and disseminating research focused on school improvement, change theory and adult learning;
- Providing training in a variety of evaluation approaches;
- Developing a resource bank of people, materials, programs, projects and funding sources.

- Facilitating awareness across districts of similar problems encountered; making it possible for people to meet, share concerns, and learn from others' experiences;
- Improving the internal coordination of state agency-administered programs.

These activities can draw upon many divisions of a state agency including the offices for research, dissemination, curriculum services, teacher preparation, and staff development. Most can play an interactive role with educators in local districts and higher education institutions.

STATE PLANS

This approach has been central to the activities of many states during this past year. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1978 (Public Law 95-561) mandated that states prepare comprehensive plans for the coordination of training monies for educators within the states. With that legislation, Congress called upon states to rethink approaches to the preparation and continued growth of education personnel; to recognize the need for maximal use of resources; to examine the coordination of existing programs from a variety of funding sources; to consider the relationship between preservice training and inservice training; and to undertake planning in ways that involve the participation of all interested groups and individuals.

A review of state plans for this new coordination effort reveals much of the functional role the states anticipated for the education agencies. One recurring definition set was:

> Coordination shall mean a process which facilitates cooperation and communication among individuals and organizations for purposes of eliminating duplication of effort; encoures cost effectiveness and efficiency in use of resources; identifies objectives which are of mutual interest and proceeds in a complementary manner to achieve such objectives. This process shall include collecting, reporting and disseminating information. The goal of strengthening services and assuring effective programs was frequently listed as well.

Statewide systems of personnel development are, for the most part, support networks for activities which appropriately occur at the local level in school districts and school buildings. It is essential that state plans reflect knowledge of the characteristics of effective programs and provide encouragement, support and consistency with sound program design.

Decisionmaking for teacher education is accomplished at multiple levels. There is no single institution or agency responsible. A variety of relationships among legislatures, state boards and commissions, state agencies, colleges and universities, local school disrict boards and administrators, and professional organizations is evident across the states. However, responsibility for the quality of educational services in public elementary and secondary schools is universally lodged with state boards of education, chief state school officers and state education agencies. Ensuring that schools are staffed with qualified personnel is an essential component of quality programs and services. Questions of the appropriate leadership role for the state, and state interaction with federal requirements under P.L. 94-142 must be considered.

Leadership Roles

The state is compelled to begin by examining its own role in leadership for system-wide change. Board members and state education agency administrators should be able to answer for themselves and for others a series of questions posed by James M. Burns about the meaning of leadership:

- Who are we?
- What are our goals?
- Where are we?
- Who are we trying to lead?
- What potential do we have?
- Where are we going?
- Is the route clear?
- What are the short term steps?
- What are the obstacles? How do we overcome them?
- How do we get where we are going?

"Announcing" that the state will be taking a leadership role in planning for improved personnel development is not enough. Agency staff will require a clear, consistent understanding of the responses to Burns' questions, and the ability both to articulate that understanding and behaviorally to demonstrate it. Decisions about educational personnel preparation and continuing education often are made in a highly charged and political atmosphere. Lack of understanding or consistency on the part of SEA staff will be detrimental to desired progress.

In a monograph entitled The Role of State Education Agencies in Inservice Education, Wendell Allen, former Washington state associate commissioner of education, comments:

> "The state agency role is to coordinate, facilitate, and be accountable and to see that accountability is spread among all participants. Good will, tolerance, patience, commitment, and persistence over a long period is essential to success . . ."
>
> "In emphasizing the facilitating role of the state education agency, I have pointed especially to the need for state agency leadership in the political process of securing support for inservice; the agency responsibility to bring together the several participating and concerned groups in both the planning and operation of inservice; and the need for positive agency staff attitudes and respectful approaches in their work with individuals and the groups participating in inservice education, such as schools, colleges, and professional associations."

System Design

Designing a statewide system of educational personnel development is a complex matter. States have a myriad of approaches to this task, reflective of the diversity among them in terms of structure, locus of decisionmaking for teacher preparation, and unique characteristics and philosophies. In spite of this diversity, a body of knowledge has emerged which can assist state boards, chief state school officers, state education agencies and their staffs to strengthen or create a personnel development system. Much of this knowledge is drawn from state experiences and has been shared in the conferences and publications of the National Council of States on Inservice Education, and other state and federally-funded projects.

In 1978, the U.S. Office of Education, through the Teacher Corps program, funded four state departments of education (Michigan, New York, Oregon, West Virginia) to examine statewide planning for staff development. The project produced A Framework For Planning Statewide Staff Development To Enhance Student Learning, a document published in 1979 and available from the West Virginia SEA.

The Framework is intended as a flexible guide not a rigid prescription for plan preparation. It has been used as a reference work for statewide and inservice plans. It provides general directions for a planning process, drawing from the experiences of the four states, and recognizes that planners will modify it appropriately to meet conditions in their particular states.

The Four State Project participants recommended that planners anticipate a five-phase process; and engage in several major activities during each phase:

Phase I: Pre-Planning

1. Identify impetus
2. Specify assumptions
3. Identify policy issues and concerns
4. Initiate activities

Phase II: Planning

1. Determine status of staff development
2. Analyze the information
3. Draft assumptions and goals
4. Specify the objectives of the plan

Phase III: Construction

1. Target key areas of recommendation
2. Compile the recommendations into a plan
3. Adopt the state plan

Phase IV: Implementation

1. Conduct an orientation
2. Train people to implement the plan
3. Put the plan into operation
4. Evaluate the state plan

Phase V: Continuous Renewal

1. Rethink basic considerations
2. Devise a strategy for continuous renewal of the plan

Components

The character of a plan and its multiple components will reflect the goals and assumptions upon which it is built, and the complexity of the system or systems to be involved in plan implementation. A regionalized approach to providing services, or one drawing upon a single state university system, would result in quite different plans from one that described the delivery of training to hundreds of individual school districts.

In many states, the determination of appropriate plan elements will include recognition of unique structures, interrelationships or particular foci for teacher training mandated by the legislature or a state board regulation. It is not rhetoric which causes us to remind policymakers of the diversity among state educational systems so often, it is reality.

A state with a professional standards and licensing commission that is organizationally separate from the state board of education would, necessarily, devise a different approach to professional development decisionmaking than a state with a single regulatory body. States using ongoing certification renewal procedures would need to consider that requirement in a personnel development plan in ways not appropriate to a state that uses a one-time certification process. Elsewhere, competency-based preparation programs might influence aspects of inservice program design.

Nevertheless, present experiences with state plans for educational personnel development suggest, as a minimum, that components be included which provide answers to these questions:

- What do we hope to accomplish?
- What are the values and assumptions upon which the plan is based?

44

- How are needs determined and prioritized?
- Who will make decisions about the program?
- Who will participate in the training?
- How will services be provided?
- What resources will be used?
- How will we know if the plan is working?
- How will this plan be changes, if needed?

EFFECTIVE STAFF DEVELOPMENT

There is a growing body of literature which describes the characteristics of effective staff development programs. State planners should be aware of these materials. State plans should harmonize with and provide support for local programs designed in ways that research and practice have demonstrated to be effective.

Chapter 8 of this monograph summarizes one document that outlines quality practices for inservice education: the report of the Quality Practices Task Force of the National Inservice Network. These recommendations focus on the creation of an inservice system, characteristics of good programs, and evaluation practices.

Another organization, the National Staff Development Council, advocates effective staff development programs which:

- Emphasize professional and personal growth and development rather than remediation;
- Initiate and support effective change based on an understanding of the change process;

- Support the stated goals of the district/school/ classroom in terms of student outcomes;
- Support individual personal self-improvement efforts within the context of organizational goal-setting and growth-oriented appraisal;
- Attend to the human needs of those for whom programs are designed, modeling positive human interaction skills;
- Incorporate sound principles of adult learning and stages of concern with change reflected in research;
- Include a comprehensive planning process with extensive system building, and/or individual input;
- Provide continuously for all levels of staff, i.e., administrators, teachers, and classified staff;
- Provide for changes in subject matter, changes in methodology, and changes in the organization;
- Relate theory and application in a practical way, modeling (when appropriate) the kind of behavior which is desired as a result of participation in the activity;
- Match the nature and length of the staff development activity to the purpose intended, i.e., orientation, short-term exposure, indepth training leading to behavior change;

- Build on the preservice training of the teacher as the beginning of a continuum of development; and
- Utilize a broad range of human resources from within schools, institutions of higher education, and in the community, where appropriate.

A Teacher Corps publication, Criteria for Local Inservice Programs, reports 29 criteria prepared after review and discussion with teachers, administrators, college and state education department personnel, and staff and leaders in teacher organizations throughout the nation. These criteria address five areas: decisionmaking, relationship to school program, resources, rewards, and commitment to teacher education. Like the quality practices and program characteristics identified earlier, they are suggestions for consideration in program design. Roy Edelfelt, in the introduction to that document, stated:

> "Criteria are more helpful than prescriptions to educators who want to design their own inservice education program. Criteria do not dictate the substance and the essence of program; they suggest standards and characteristics. They also set forth principles for decisions about the conditions and circumstances of planning and operation."

The criteria and characteristics highlighted here are drawn from experiences with effective programs. They are based upon an understanding of strategies and principles of adult learning. They reflect sound teaching and learning theories.

One way to know if a state plan is a good one is to examine it in light of our knowledge about programs of staff development. Allen, again in The Role of State Education Agencies in Inservice Education, proposes a checklist which, when combined with one or more of the criteria already described, offers a valuable tool for both planners and policy makers to use in examining the completeness and quality of a state plan.

1. A Legal Framework for Organization
   Do state laws and regulations provide a basis for:
   a. Establishment of formal relationships and commitments among autonomous/independent agencies?
   b. Planning and implementation by these agencies of various professional development programs to serve school, public, and agency needs and purposes?
   c. Planning and carrying out by individuals of personal and professional growth activities?
   d. Cooperative planning by individuals and agencies of professional development activities designed to meet their respective needs and purposes?

2. A Conceptual Framework
   Is there a conceptual framework for the preparation of education personnel reflected in the laws, regulations, policies, and/or practices of the state legislature, the state education agency, school administrations, higher education institutions, and teacher organizations that recognizes:
   a. Professional preparation as career-long?
   b. A relationship between individual needs and goals and school program needs and purposes?
   c. Changing professional role patterns?
   d. The multiple roles of all professionals?
   e. The implications of changing and developing social conditions for school program and continuing education?
   f. The need for interrelated responsibilities and roles of the state education agency, school administrations, higher education institutions, teacher organizations, and the individual professional?

3. A Design Framework
   Is there a comprehensive state design for professional development that provides for:
   a. Ordering of the relationships among the state education agency, school administrations, higher education institutions, teacher organizations, and the individual professional?
   b. Determination of continuing education needs of education personnel based on the personal and professional growth needs of the individual and the instructional program needs and purposes of the school?
   c. Collaborative planning and implementation of continuing education programs?
   d. A process of allocating responsibilities for program operation in the context of available expertise and other appropriate resources?
   e. A process for quality control of program administration and operation at all levels?
   f. Planning and creating of new and multiple designs for continuing education programs that are appropriate to meet the particular needs of various situations and people in local education programs?

4. A Support Framework
   Is there a support framework for continuing education that provides for:
   a. Preparation related to state certification requirements?
   b. Preparation not related to state certification requirements?
   c. Preparation designed to meet school program needs and purposes?
   d. Preparation designed to meet the individual's personal and professional growth needs?
   e. Preparation to meet the professional growth needs of individuals in different phases of their careers?
   f. Preparation that is part of the total instructional program design?
   g. Financial, logistical, physical, technological, and personnel support for professional development activities?

We live in a time of change. John Gardner when speaking of human renewal, says "A society must court the kinds of change that will enrich and strengthen it, rather than the kinds that will fragment and destroy it. Renewal . . . is . . . the process of bringing the results of change into line with our purposes." We cannot be about Gardner's task unless we are clear about what those purposes are.

There is nothing simple about the political and economic realities of education in the 1980's. It is a very demanding business to create a statewide personnel development system that is intended to make positive impact on staff and a significant difference for students. There is much to challenge us, and much to discourage us. There is a limit to the number of issues which can be addressed; contraints in the number of questions which can be asked. Those limitations require selectivity and choice.

Nevertheless, the sound foundation that "teachers are already competent professionals who wish to develop greater expertise . . . as facilitators of... learning" (Weiler, p. 90) is a major operational premise. Richard Snelling, in a 1979 adress to the Education

Commission of the States at its annual meeting talked abut risk-taking as a governor. His words equally are applicable to state boards of education:

> "If the (state board member) of any state accepts as a part of his or her responsibility the improvement of the quality of education, he or she must accept the grat risks, both intellectually and politically, of being willing to probe, of being prepared to find what he finds, of seeking counsel from every corner, including but not limited to the education establishment. He or she must have the courage to reach out and attempt to change whatever in the system is responsible in any degree for results less than those results that might be attained with the same resources and with the same standards."

Attention to what we already know about good planning and effective programs; and leadership which brings together in cooperative working arrangements the many individuals and agencies with a stake in educational personnel development; these can result in quality programs of staff development in every state.

REFERENCES

Allen, C. The Role of State Education Agencies in Inservice Education. Syracuse, New York: National Council of States on Inservice Education, 1978.

Andrews-Bryant Associates. Maryland Professional Development Conference Proceedings and Results. March, 1979.

Brain, B. Political issues in teacher education and certification, Political Issues in Education. Washington, D.C.: The Council of Chief State School Officers, 1978.

Edelfelt, A. Inservice Education, Criteria for and Examples of Local Programs. Bellingham, Washington: 1977.

Feistritzer Associates. The 1981 Report on Educational Personnel Development. Washington, D.C.: 1980.

The Four State Project. A Framework For Planning Statewide Staff Development To Enhance Student Learning. August, 1979.

Johnson, Inservice Education: Priority for the '80's. Syracuse, New York: 1980.

Kunz, A Synthesis of th Phoenix Report. Unpublished paper, 1978.

National Council of States on Inservice Education. If you had a choice, where would you work? Inservice. June, 1980.

National Council of States on Inservice Education. State Leadership for Inservice Education; Report of Work Groups from Phoenix Conference. Syracuse, New York: 1978.

National Staff Development Council. The Journal of Staff Development. May, 1980. (1)

Snelling, Getting it all together. Compact. Winter, 1980.

Weiler, J. Federal teacher center insrvice observation. Action in Teacher Education. Spring 1980.(2)

Gardner, W. Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society. New York: 1964.

Chapter 4

OPTIONS FOR ACTION BY STATE BOARD MEMBERS TO IMPROVE THE PREPARATION OF EDUCATION PERSONNEL

by

Helen Hartle

INTRODUCTION

Educators and citizens throughout the nation identify the need for professional improvement of all educational personnel as critical. Although many professional development activities now are underway, there virtually is universal agreement that greater efforts must be made: to upgrade the competence of personnel working in elementary and secondary schools; and to assure that those in training will be well equipped to handle conditions found in the schools not only today but tomorrow.

With the enactment of Public Law 94-142, this concern has deepened, because it is apparent that most general educators are unprepared to work in regular classrooms with children who have handicapping conditions. Special educators are not prepared for new patterns of instructional organization necessitated by implementation of this federal law.

A number of measures are being taken nationwide to improve professional educators' competence by various individuals and groups. One key group with potential for affecting significant improvement is the state board of education in each state. The state board is in a unique position to make both short and long range improvements for preservice and inservice eduction. While there are differences in structure and function of boards from state to state, there are steps in common which board members can take in all states that will make a difference. Some of the suggestions described below grow out of regulatory powers of state boards; others come from monitoring functions required for consumer protection responsibilities, or from leadership responsibilities which are exercised by state board members to provide the best possible education for students in their state.

In the following discussion, initial suggestions are those steps which state board members may take to improve preservice education, particularly to accommodate to the requirements of Public Law 94-142. They also may be used generally to upgrade all preservice education. Next, recommendations are made for state board actions designed to improve the competence of educators currently working in the schools. Finally some comments and cautions to state board members are noted that concern their unique responsibilities in facilitating the professional development of all educators in their states.

WHAT CAN STATE BOARD MEMBERS DO ABOUT PRESERVICE EDUCATION?

State board members, in almost all states, can exert a great deal of influence on all preservice professional education programs through measures ranging from: 1) state board final powers of approval for program preparation standards, 2) approval of certification requirements, 3) approval of preparation to 4) approval of funds for higher education (in some states).

State board authority can be used effectively to upgrade professional preparation programs that accommodate Public Law 94-142 and other unique personnel needs of schools in each state, in the following ways:

(1) Program Approval Standards

State board members can take measures to ensure that state approved program standards adopted for use adequately address personnel preparation needs to accommodate Public Law 94-142; that is, that adopted standards do equip general educators with the skills, knowledge and attitudes they need for working with handicapped children in regular classrooms along with their non-handicapped peers.

In most states, schools of education must abide by state preparation standards, if they are to prepare educational professionals who can be certified in that state. Often state board members have final approval of state standards used for this purpose. They can assure that state-approved program standards adopted for use adequately do address personnel preparation needs to accommodate Public Law 94-142; that is, do indeed equip general educators with skills, knowledge and attitudes needed with handicapped children in regular classrooms along with non-handicapped peers.

Competence cannot be assured by a single course requirement in special education, although that is a step in the right direction. Most effective is competence for working with handicapped children as well as non-handicapped children, an important objective that be included in all required courses for the prospective educator. State board members, therefore, should examine state preparation standards to ascertain that they contain provisions to reasonably assure this competence for all educators.

Care must be exercised also that programs prepare special educators for work in a variety of settings in which handicapped children are served, and that they include preparation to work with organizational patterns such as mainstreaming and resource room teaching and other innovations growing out of Public Law 94-142 compliance.

(2) Certification Requirements

> State board members should examine certification require ments for adequate provisions to assure that all certification holders are competent to teach both handicapped and non-handicapped children in regular classrooms.

Each state has a set of requirements which have developed through the beliefs that groups have minimum general requirements for certification or those which fit unique needs. These requirements affect both preservice and inservice education through initial and continuing certification. In many states, additional certification requirements include course requirements or competence in special education areas. State board certification requirements should contain adequate provisions to assure that all certification holders are competent to teach both handicapped and non-handicapped children in regular classrooms.

(3) Needs Assessments and Manpower Studies

> State board members should know about state supply and demand surveys or manpower studies so that they can encourage schools of education to institute programs that are needed and not in oversupply.

To ensure adequate numbers of quality educators to meet current school demands, state board members should examine statistics that reflect qualified special education personnel available and data that indicate numbers of special and regular educators required to fill the state's present and future needs. This suggestion should not be construed to mean that admissions to schools of education or new programs should be limited to existing needs. There are no guarantees that present students will remain in a state and no accurate predicators of future specific needs for educational personnel.

State board members' awareness of supply and demand surveys and manpower studies can enable them to encourage schools of education to institute needed programs and reduce those in oversupply. In some states, the state board of education has direct authority over this. In others, it is necessary for elementary/secondary state board members to work cooperatively with state boards of higher education through the state approval process for instituting and approving new programs. To achieve balance, it is essential that supply and demand figures for special educators and their need for professional improvement be considered in a coordinated overall state plan for improvement of professional education.

4) Approving Preparation Programs for Certification

> To assure that all new applicants for certification possess the skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary to work effectively with all children, state board of education members should examine all recommended programs carefully before final approval is given.

In many cases state boards of education retain final approval over professional education preparation programs leading to certification which have been evaluated according to state standards. These evaluations are conducted by the state certification agency or a professional standards and practices board. There are numerous steps state board members can take to ascertain that the programs being submitted for approval are of high quality. State board of education members should examine all recommended programs carefully before final approval is given to assure that all new applicants for certification have the skills, knowledge and attitudes they need to work effectively with all children.

State board members need pay careful attention to the admission and retention standards for prospective teachers that are practiced by higher education institutions to ensure: (1) that capable students are selected for professional education preparation programs and, (2) that they ultimately are recommended for certification.

Evaluation is another critical factor in quality assurance. There is general agreement that follow-up studies of graduates conducted by schools of education to determine their abiity to function effectively in elementary and secondary schools are useful. In some places this is provided through state standards, wherein preparation programs are monitored carefully for compliance with the standard. The final approval authority of state board of education members can be a powerful tool to improve the preparation of all educational personnel within states and it should be well exercised.

(5) Assistance to Schools of Education Within States

State board members can work directly or indirectly to assist schools of education to meet state program approval standards for the preparation of educational personnel.

For schools of education to comply with state program approval standards, help is needed. The reasons for non-compliance may vary. Sometimes schools of education lack necessary resources, or sufficient numbers of qualified faculty to implement effective programs. In the case of preparing educators to meet Public Law 94-142 mandates that require new skills, university faculty often have not had sufficient opportunity for retraining in these approaches.

In some states, board members can act directly to assist schools of education. In others, they may work cooperatively with postsecondary boards. When the need is primarily financial, state board members must look to both state and federal resources. Usually the institutions are aware of federal resources. The new federal Higher Education Act contains a number of relevant provisions. Teacher Corps, Teacher Centers, The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, and grants for training teachers to work with handicapped students in geographic areas where there is short supply, are but a few aspects of that Act which could provide supplemental revenues. Refinements of administrative procedures within universities may be needed to make program adjustments less difficult and more responsive to needs. There are numerous institutional barriers to implementing changes to meet existing conditions. School board members, while they may not have direct control, might investigate the problem and exert influence to improve the situation.

Needs assessments to determine sources required by schools of education to meet current demands for training educators for elementary and secondary schools are helpful. State board members can play a leadership role by requesting data derived from such needs assessments before making recommendations for state funding to schools of education.

Another suggestion is that state boards identify exemplary professional education programs in schools of education to serve as models for other institutions. This action has twofold value: first, model programs become known to other preparation institutions; and second, recognition of excellence provides positive reinforcement to those whose programs are noteworthy.

WHAT CAN STATE BOARD MEMBERS DO ABOUT INSERVICE EDUCATION?

While preservice education cannot be ignored by state board members, perhaps a more critical need is to improve the quality of educational personnel through inservice education for those now employed in schools. This is particularly true regarding new skills required of regular classroom teachers by Public Law 94-142.

State board members can and should play significant roles in facilitation of inservice opportunities for all educational personnel through a variety of approaches. Some suggested steps may be more appropropriate for particular boards than others, but it is essential that state boards have a thorough understanding of: 1) the inservice education activities that are presently underway in their states; 2) the nature of critical in-service needs and 3) those steps to take to assure that all educational personnel are equipped adequately with the skills, knowledge and attitudes to comply with Public Law 94-142 mandates and to meet the needs of all youth now being served by the schools.

Discussions abound on who should bear the cost inservice education. Some argue that costs for certain kinds of inservice education should be borne by the individual professional educator. Few would argue that the professional educator should bear all inservice costs for the professional development necessitated by enactment of laws such as P.L. 94-142.

"Tools" are available which all school board members could use to improve inservice opportunities in cases where local education agencies have taken little or no action, where help is needed to provide inservice opportunities for all personnel, or where educational personnel do not take advantage of the inservice education opportunities available. These tools are described below:

Recertification Requirements

> If a state has recertification provisions, state board of education members may examine them to determine whether regulations might be used to address inservice needs relating to Public Law 94-142.

The nationwide trend is toward making changes in state certification practices to include "recertification" or "continuing" certification requirements for all professional educators within a state. This marks a shift from the single level, lifetime certification pattern that permitted the certificate holder to teach indefinitely without taking any kind of additional training.

If a state has recertification provisions, state board members may examine them to determine whether these regulations might be used to address inservice needs relating P.L. 94-142. For example, regulations can be worded to encourage the participation of regular classroom teachers in inservice activities which equip them to work effectively with certain handicapped as well as non-handicapped children in a regular classroom. Further, special education certificate holders may be encouraged to pursue inservice education activities which would equip them to work in various settings within which handicapped children are now served. State certification agency personnel can help by suggesting ways to reward recertification regulations to produce desired effects.

Professional Development Plans

> State board members, in most states, have played a role in developing comprehensive state plans required by federal legislation. For those who have not, it is recommended that they examine the existing plans to clarify the current status of professional development needs and resources within their own states.

To qualify for federal funds, state departments of education recently have been required to submit comprehensive professional development plans under several federal laws, most recently Titles IV and V of Public Law 95-561. Through the development of these plans, state education agencies are beginning to learn about what professional development activities are occurring; and what local, state and federal resources are available for professional development.

State board members, in most states, have played a role in developing comprehensive state plans required by such federal legislation. For those who have not, it is recommended that they examine the existing plans to clarify the current status of professional development needs within their own states.

In some local school districts, all professional educators design and submit their own professional development plans. This practice has been effective because the professional development is relevant, systematic and complete. State board members might suggest such an approach to local education agencies where improved practices are needed.

Released Time

> School board members should investigate the possible effective use of the "released time" concept.

Not only is the cost of inservice education an issue but solutions are needed to find time for such activities. The term "released time" creates problems whenever it is used. Parents tend to disapprove of early dismissal of children from school to allow teachers time to engage in inservice activities. They feel even worse about children having full days off while teachers participate in "inservice" days. The practice has been misused by some schools when the days are allocated for routine tasks which teachers could have performed at part of their daily work. In some cases school board policy contains specific guidelines for the use of released time that have been agreed upon by boards and professional educators.

School board members investigate the possible effective use of the released time concept. It is an important concept which should not be dismissed automatically as a poor idea. Rather, care should be taken to ensure that the practice is not abused. If a professional educators are expected to spend their own time and/or money for professional development activities, it is unlikely that inservice professional development programs will be successful. Some comprise might be negotiated such as matching the professional educator's released time with some of his or her own personal time.

Often summers are used by local school districts for personnel development activities. Again, questions of time and money need solution. With funds available, some professional educators do avail themselves of inservice training opportunities, but, unfortunately, some prefer not to participate, even though they might benefit professionally from it. State board members should investigate means to support local school district summer professional development activities.

Recognition

> One often overlooked tool which state board members might use to further professional development is the recognition of excellence for either individuals or local education agency professional development efforts.

Currently there are excellent practices underway where dedicated professionals individually, and in groups, are using new approaches to and content of inservice education. These exemplary programs should be publicized so that others could adapt them and so that the innovators will receive positive feedback for their good work. If the state board has a regualr publication, successful inservice efforts might be publicized there. Local newspapers can be peresuaded often to publicize educational news, particularly when programs receive recognition by the state board of education.

Mini Grants

> Small amounts of discretionary money often are available for state board of education use. These funds might be set aside for "mini grants" to local education agencies or small groups to design to design and pilot professional development activities for designated inservice needs.

There is a shortage of money for inservice education at all levels of government. However, there are ways to use available funds more effectively. In many cases, money is either "earmarked" for specified activities or is allotted through a formula. In spite of these restrictions, small amounts of money often are available for use at the discretion of state boards of education. These funds might be set aside for mini grants to local education agencies or small groups to design and pilot professional development activities for designated inservice needs. The total amount involved or the number of grants given need not be large. An important element is the recognition of a superior professional development effort. There is a "pay off" for all who compete because of the values derived through the planning process.

GENERAL CAUTIONS AND PITFALLS

While there are many steps state board members may take to improve professional development in the schools, there are some pitfalls and cautious as well.

1) Attention should be given to both preservice and inservice personnel preparation within a state. While inservice needs may appear to be more critical, preservice programs cannot be ignored. Unless appropriate changes are made to update preservice education programs, inservice needs will continue to grow as new crises arise.

2) "Band Aid" approaches should not be substituted for efforts to develop and implement comprehensive personnel development plans within a state. While short-term measures do improve overall state efforts,

preoccupation with small unrelated measures can obscure the need for long-range comprehensive efforts.

3) Sometimes well-meaning special interest groups within a state may get more than their fair share of state board attention. This can result in a distorted plan. For example, special educators or vocational educators may persuade school board members that their professional development needs are more critical than are those of others. This frequently occurs in some categorical federal funding practices experienced by many state personnel. School board members must keep in perspective _all_ of the youth who are served in the schools. A comprehensive plan which outlines the needs for all areas can prevent some of the lopsided attention special interet groups may receive.

4) Plans for professional development should be compehensive and geared to both long-range and shorter term goals. Priorities should be set but no so firmly that they cannot be adjusted to meet unexpected needs. Plans should include all possible avenues of human and financial resources.

5) Providing adequate professional development for all educational personnel is an enormous task, but it should not be ignored because of its magnitude. Unresolved problems include the lack of financial resources, and, in some instances, the unwillingness of persons to receive training. Nevertheless, state board members cannot and should not overlook their responsibilities as either elected or appointed officials in this regard. Research supports the belief that schools are only as good as the educational personnel who staff them. Even

when there are well-equipped schools, caring parents, and well-behaved children, a school's program can fail if its professional education personnel are not prepared adequately. This important responsibility cannot be left solely to the school professionals themselves or to faculties of preparation programs at postsecondary institutions. There are unique tools which state board members have, by virtue of their position, that can and must be used to improve the competence of professional educators in the schools.

SUMMARY

The improvement of competence in professional educators is the responsibility of all state board of education members working together with legislators, professional educators, local school boards, university faculty and staff, and parents. Board members cannot do the job alone nor can they ignore it. In light of evidence on effective schools, it is a concern which should receive top priority.

It is difficult for state board members to sidestep they myriad of other problems which often "bog down" overwhelm them. To be effective, long-term improvements must be made in the schools, and state board members will face the responsibility to provide for or facilitate the best possible professional development program.

Chapter 5
INSERVICE TRAINING

by

Philip H. Mann

INTRODUCTION

The provision of continuous inservice training for educators is important to satisfy the diverse needs of their clientele. The school, as one stratum of the educational organization, has evolved in recent years to a point where the need for renewal for service delivery personnel (e.g., administrators, faculty, and staff) is critical. It is critical in the sense that state and federal mandates require organizational, managerial, attitudinal, and behavioral changes throughout the school generally, but in the classroom specifically. Many of the changes may not have previously been a part of the school's general practices or standard operating procedures. For example, the traditional school organizational patterns with traditional classroom organization and management strucures now must accommodate students with special needs in regular classrooms.

Effectiveness, in the level of performance of educators who teach students exhibiting special needs, is of concern to policymakers, administrators, and parents. Professional growth is necessary through the acquisition of additional skills in areas related to students with special needs by individuals already employed in educational positions. These individuals must continue to improve their expertise as a part of the process of continuous professional self-development.

A variety of rationales are used to justify the need for inservice education:

1. An abundance of new information is expected to be learned by educators in shorter periods of time;
2. Expansion of the educational delivery system now requires that more responsibility for students exhibiting special needs be assumed by general educators;
3. Considerations now must be addressed that specifically relate to cultural and ethnic diversity within the area of special needs, including the gifted;
4. The improvement of competencies of current practitioners who must respond to what constitutes optimal learning environments in which students exhibiting special needs will be successful.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

Quality practices of inservice education include attend to several important basic assumptions. First, educators who have been prepared in traditional teacher preparation programs often selectively attend to only those populations of students that they perceive themselves prepared to teach. Teachers, for example, perceive themselves as independent of all categories that do not pertain to their particular area of emphasis or teaching skill level. They cannot be expected automatically, without additional preparation, to expand their performance capabilities so that additional populations of students can benefit from their instruction.

Second, the traditional organizational pattern for isntruction in our schools is based on arbitrary age and grade parameters (e.g., early childhood, primary grades, intermediate grades, middle school, junior high school, and senior high school). This has led to a compartmentalization of instructional pratices and inservice training programs. It is obvious that students do not learn in accordance with these arbitrary divisions. The present system operates with relative ease as long as the degree of learner varibility is not too large within a given class of students. A great deal, of course, depends on the experience and abilities of the teacher.

A third basic assumption is that there are intangibles that need to be a part of inservice education and that go beyond the acquisition of "teaching" skills. This entails the development of attitudes and characteristics by professionals who will be responsible fo rthe education of students exhibiting special needs. These include:

1. Open-mindedness and willingness to accept evaluation;
2. The ability to be creative and to expand upon the use of present resources;
3. A vitality evidenced by seeking uncoerced avenues or opportunities to expand one's skills;
4. The ability to be adaptable and flexible as populations and characteristics of students change, requiring continuous modification in teaching strategies;
5. The ability to problem solve with different populations of students including those with special needs and the gifted;

6. The ability to ask appropriate questions about educational concerns and to evaluate alternatives so that decisionmaking skills will improve;
7. The ability to take things to their logical or natural conclusion through a continuous process of acceptance, clarification, modification, and rejection of ideas.

Another important assumption for those designing inservice programs is that the inherent worthiness of a practical concept does not insure its acceptance or implementation into instructional programming for students with special needs. Acceptance, in fact, is predicated upon responding to the needs of the adult population (educators) who are receiving inservice training. Inservice education, therefore, should be directed toward extending the educator's need for professional growth, as well as imparting new knowledge and relevant information that is intended to improve the competencies of those providing educational services.

ADULT LEARNING

It is fallacious to assume that adults can be "trained" in the same way that we "teach" children. Recent investigations (Kersh, 1979; Dillon, 1979; Knowles, 1978; Bischof, 1976 and McLeish, 1978) suggest tat in designing inservice programs, it is important to take into consideration the following concepts inherent in adult learning:

1. Adults exhibit a greater desire to be self-directed.
2. Adults tend to gain more from learning that involves participation in experiences that demonstrate concepts along with formal presentations.
3. Learning experiences for adults should be related to experiences that the individual has in his or her own job or educational setting.
4. Adult learning is more successful when the participants are involved in a problem solving experience.
5. Adult learning is more successful when it is in a relaxed and comfortable setting.
6. Individuals are more receptive when they are not intimidated to participate.

Many professionals believe that effective training programs are more likely to result when training is directed toward the specific needs of the recipients (Hentschel, 1977; King, Hayes, and Newman, 1977; Rude, 1978). If the teacher involved in inservice training, for example, do not feel a neeed to change, content may not be assimilated. The Rand study (Berman P., and McLaughlin, M.W., 1978) indicated that regardless of how innovative a program is, unless the individuals involved are also part of the decisionmaking process (i.e., needs assessment or planning for inservice training) minimal benefits will accrue in implementing new practices learned.

Training that ultimately will result in performance that affects participants' learning on a carer long basis appears to be more favorably received than fragmented programs designed to address a narrow and immediate concern. Planning with those directly responsible for the education of students is of primary importance. Training must be deemed worthwhile and relevant to the teacher's role in the school, to gain systematic participation.

The whole concept of governance with regard to policymaking must be undertaken as a collaborative effort with each element (those who plan for taining, receive training, and develop training programs) having parity in the decisionmaking process. Any single participant should have the same rights and power as any other participant within the larger system. Consideration must be given to how control over inservice training presently is vested. School administrators and university personnel have tended to dominate this process. Policymakers are in a position to establish guidelines for more equitable governance emphasizing the role of the clients, the teachers, the adult learners, in the process.

KEY ELEMENTS

Needs Assessment

The importance of needs assessment in inservice training cannot be overemphasized. Needs assessment is defined as a process by which a perceived and/or real need, if responded to, would improve the performance of the individual in a particular area.

Two dimensions of needs assessment are envisioned for policymakers. First is a process by which the important competencies necessary for effectiveness with students who have special needs are delineated. This process requires input from adminisrators, teachers, and parents. It is particularly important to receive information on and approval of specified competencies by teachers, since they are most directly responsible fo the education of children.

The second dimension involves establishing guidelines by which local school districts can respond to the personal needs of each educator within the parameters delineated by the competences. Therefore, a needs asessment should be performed at the local school district level to determine both appropriate program content and training delivery. Taken to its logical conclusion those who deliver inservice training would respond to teachers' needs in terms of competencies rather than through predetermined courses.

Wherever there are problems to be solved or questions to be answered, the concept of precise needs assessment exists. Educators are now being forced into more formalized programming procedures for students exhibiting a wide range of behavior and learning problems. They must respond to an increasing number of questions about what constitutes an appropriate education. In viewing current trends in education, including P.L. 94-142, we need to anticipate what can be helpful in responding to the needs of educators who will be programming for handicapped students.

Training Based on Competency Development

Some high quality programs have emphasized specific instructional skills as the major thrust of their inservice training. Others have emphasized human relations activities in an attempt to influence attitudes and to bring about a better understanding of the characteristics and needs of handicapped students. Exemplary inservice training programs recognize that knowledge and performance skills are inseparately related in considering what learning experiences are necessary to develop the desired traits and skills in teachers.

Though programs and needs may differ in some respects, there are common areas of competency that exist within most good quality inservice training programs. Three areas should be considered in planning for the delineation of statewide competencies for educators. The competencies are clustered within two major areas: Student Specific Competencies and Student Related Competencies.

Student Specific Competencies

Student specific competencies are those which are essential for effectiveness in direct instruction of students exhibiting special needs. They are generic skills that all educators should exhibit in order to be effective in student-educator relationships or in situations directly related to learner behavior. A variety of competencies can be developed within three primary areas:

1. Analysis of student behavior, which includes student assessment of learners with special needs;
2. Individualization of curriculum and instruction with related materials and teaching strategies for students exhibiting special needs;
3. Management of learning environments, which includes behavior management, classroom organization and use of resource and support personnel for students with special needs.

Student Related Competencies

Educators also need student related competencies for the establishment of effective learning environments for students with special needs. Some examples of student related competencies are:

1. School-Community Relations

   Educators should be expeced to:

   a. demonstrate the ability to communicae effectively with parents, guardians and community members in matters concerning students with special needs;
   b. collaborate effectively with parents, guardians and community members in planning, developing, and implementing programs that will respond to the educational and social-emotional needs of learners exhibiting special needs;
   c. interpret school policy and practices to all concerned in areas related to students with special needs;

d. develop a receptive school atmosphere for parents or guardians of students with special needs and encourage their participation in school activities.

e. collaborate effectively with parents, guardians and community members to develop and implement programs that reflect multicultural concerns of special needs children.

2. School-Student Relations

Educators should be expected to:

a. demonstrate good individual counseling and group process abilities in response to the needs of all students including those with special needs;

b. provide an environment in which all students, including those with special needs, have access to and play a part in classroom as well as in school affairs;

c. demonstrate an understanding of the concepts of handicapped, disabled and the school role and responsibility in programming for handicapped learners in light of current legislation.

3. School Staff Relations

Educators should be expected to:

a. participate effectively with fellow educators and support personnel in planning, designing, implementing, and evaluating school programs in areas involving special needs students;

b. work with fellow educators in shared responsibility relationships to improve academic, social-emotional, as well as leisure time programs for students exhibiting special needs;

c. demonstrate the ability to work effectively with all school personnel including secretaries, maintenance workers, volunteers, paraprofessionals, and professional support personnel in those areas affecting students with special needs.

4. Personnel and Professional Competency

Educators should be expected:

a. exhibit the characteristics and attitudes that reflect humanistic and ethical behavior in activities relating to the education of all students including those with special needs;

b. periodically assess their own professional competencies, identify strengths, weaknesses and the need for further self-improvement in areas relating to students with special needs;

c. play a constructive role in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of inservice training programs;

d. demonstrate an understanding of legislation related to providing services to students with special needs and apply those mandates in their particular learning situations.

POLICYMAKERS AND TRAINING DELIVERY

Policymakers, in an attempt to establish regulations for certification in the area of students with special needs, must be careful not to limit teachers responses to these regulations to one narrowly defined course. It is difficult to withstand incipient political pressure, particularly from institutions of higher education, many of whom are prepared to offer "the course" in special education. It is important to determine whether or not the course that will be offered is negotiable so that course content reflects actual needs of regular classroom teachers. Traditionally, special education courses were designed for educators who would work with small groups in segregated settings, or as resource teachers. Regular educators, working with handicapped children, are going to require other alternatives for instructional programming.

- An appropriate role for policymakers in inservice education is one of setting guidelines by which the training that will, in effect, respond to pre-established state competencies for teachers.

There are several alternatives to the practice of offering one content course in areas dealing with special needs students.

- It is suggested that all courses offered for general educators include the area of special needs within the general content and methodology. This is in keeping with the concept of developmental learning. These courses should be broad in scope and address the needs of exceptional as well as regular students. With methods courses (e.g., reading, mathematics, or science), for educators, curriculum should include instructional alternatives and ways to modify content and procedures for students exhibiting special needs.

Other alternatives for information sharing and competency development include:

1. A course or courses that address specific competencies based on a needs assessment of the recipients;
2. Short-term institutes that respond to specific competency areas;
3. Workshops that involve information sharing as well as practical experiences with students;
4. An approved plan of independent study;
5. Participation in supervised learning-teaching experiences, such as working in summer programs with special needs students.

- Policymakers should have an understanding of the various factors that affect implementation of inservice training. Such factors include incentive factors, procedural factors, and content factors. Those who develop guidelines may wish to incorporate any of those listed below within the state inservice design.

Incentive Factors

1. College credit
2. Salary increments
3. Points toward certification and renewal
4. Stipends
5. Tuition waivers
6. Recognition of professional activities, such as attending conventions
7. Opportunities for peer-training through teacher visitation
8. Opportunities for materials development and classroom demonsrations

Other incentives include:

1. Shared governance through participation in needs assessment and planning where specific needs are identified;
2. Self-selection of personal goals and self-planning of individual activities;
3. Training activities that occur during released school time;
4. Training that is paid by public funds as part of the employment agreement;
5. Awarding certificates of accomplishment or attainment;
6. Changes in status or position in the school;
7. Emphasis on field-based training.

Incentive factors for those who deliver training include:

1. State support for training programs
2. Field-based activity in lieu of teaching courses on campus
3. Consulting
4. Opportunities for research

Procedural Factors

1. Use a training design that is flexible and allows for content and process negotiation by the participants.
2. Develop an individual educational plan for each teacher that is based upon the concept of adult learning and self-choice.
3. Develop procedures that will achieve optimal results in terms of outcomes. These could include lectures, discussion, role playing, simulation, modeling as well as problem-centered activities.
4. Assess characteristics of the inservice program leaders including personality, leadership, expertise, presentation skills, and the ability to elicit feelings of trust.
5. Document immediate and long-term effects of programs so that data extrapolation can be used for multiplier effects. This includes the assessment of knowledge, performance, and attitudes as well as the use of instruments, interviews, and observations.
6. Provide opportunities for participants to generate ideas, activities, and materials as part of the planning process.

7. Organize the inservice program so that personnel are involved in self-instruction, using prepared materials that follow objectives and a planned sequence of events.

8. Individualize training experiences. Build a program of diverse activities for different teachers as opposed to one common set for all participants.

9. Assess changes in teacher behavior and ultimately in pupil behavior in terms of the training provided.

Content Factors

1. Accurately identify training areas and topics.
2. Determine the degree of previous exposure to proposed content areas of training,
3. Decide how participants will have opportunities to share ideas and materials in the content area.
4. Define what aspects of content are related to curriculum developement.
5. Assess whether the content is consistent with school goals and in keeping with instructional objectives.
6. Evaluate whether the training program contains conceptual or knowledge-based objectives as well as teaching skills objectives.

Observation and Practice

Opportunities for teachers to observe and practice new learning regarding "how to teach students exhibiting special needs", is an important part of inservice training. Several alternatives are suggested:

1. Observe the way students with special needs learn in order to identify and understand those variables that impede learning.
2. Observe individuals with a history of success in teaching students with special needs. This entails the utilization of modeling, learning form the successful behavior and activities of teachers who are working with children with problems on a day-to-day basis.
3. Participate in the demonstration of techniques that have proven successful.
4. Work directly in activities with studens with special needs under observation, preferably by peers.

All of these experiences provide "laboratory" settings for experimentation and observation that constitute both a scientific approach to teaching and learning and an opportunity to give a sense of reality to formal training presentations.

Practical Considerations

Since practice is inseparable from the acquisition of facts and ideas, the training arms that include the institutions of higher education, teacher centers, and other systems, should resond to the need for appropriate practice. The following should be considered:

1. A careful analysis of the time variable. Time must be allotted for teachers to observe and interact with others;
2. A determination of practice areas of priority;

3. Comprehensive in the degree and quality of the practice experience;
4. Interrelatedness of knowledge gained through simulation activities and reality-testing in classroom setting;
5. The skills of the observers to include teacher specialists, consultants, and professors;
6. Continuous progress monitoring of practice with opportunities for reevaluation.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

A procedure must be developed for community involvement in the process of identifying and dealing with educational problems, and development of inservice training needs of educators. Community backing for inservice training is needed from a perspective of financial support, as well as for implementation of programmatic changes that will be an effect of the training itself.

Schools in today's society are experiencing a serious threat to the financial support of their programs and staffing. Parents and community members who pay taxes may be unaware of existing training needs or their ideas may conflict with school district priorities. It is, therefore, important that community members be involved in the identification of school priorities for training. Involving the community in the process can provide an opportunity for a school district to:

1. Improve communications among the different components of the school and the community;
2. Improve the level of community awareness concerning training needs and programs of the school district;
3. Promote planning that examines issues and is substantive by focusing on ways to improve teaching and learning in the shcools;
4. Gain substantive input and provide suggestions for direction to the local board of education;
5. Increase community interest-level with resultant support for increases in the funding level of the school district for training activities.

Community awareness of program content and procedures can be accomplished in different ways. Meeting can occur within a committee structure. The composition can be weighted to varying degrees with parents and community members. Opportunities for the exchange of information among committee members can be provided through forums and inservice presentations. Training programs should be fully explained and community members should have the opportunity to provide information as well as to ask questions. Although consensus among identified constituents may not be reached, the important thing is to provide an opportunity for the discussion of divergent views. The desired effect is to raise the awareness level of the participants to a point of understanding and appreciating the problems associated with inservice training needs.

SUMMARY

As educators develop additional skills that enable them to be effective with students exhibiting special needs, they will become better educators in the general sense. To this extent, high quality training should emphasize attitudes as well as preciseness in educators' observational and instructional strategies. This extends beyond the basic understanding of the nature and needs of the handicapped population. Without the emphasis on quality and preciseness, it is unrealistic to expect teachers to be accountable fo the variability in their clasroom and to be scientific in their selection and utilization of appropriate resources.

The key to developing a successful continuum of activities in the area of special needs is to emphasize those aspects of training that are creative, uniquely personalized, and relevant to the individual. It is important to remember that inservice training must extend beyond the development of instructional skills. It must develop positive attitudes toward children. In this way teachers will be able to motivate students to learn. One way to develop good attitudes is to ensure that individuals are supported. Policymakers as a group do not desire to provide additional burdens to already overburdened educators. With this in mind, they should be sensitive to the needs of teachers by making provisions for flexibility in the way teachers acquire the needed competencies. Incentives for participation and recognition of adult learning processes should be considered as guidelines are developed.

Chapter 6

PRESERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS AND AMINISTRATORS

by

Catherine Morsink

In the spring of 1980, on leave from my position as Chairperson of the Department of Special Education at the University of Kentucky, I became a third grade teacher in a classroom with "mainstreamed" handicapped children. The purpose of this venture was to discover what elementary teachers needed to know in order to assume their new responsibilities as educators of handicapped children. This experience, supplemented by reading and talking with others provided the background for this chapter which is organized around two basic questions: (1) What changes need to be made in existing preservice training programs? (2) How are institutions of higher education responding to these needs for change?

NEEDED CHANGES IN EXISTING PRESERVICE PROGRAMS

The term "preservice program", as used here, means traditional four-year college coursework and student teaching leading to teacher certification or five-years plus coursework leading to administrative licensure. There are changes needed in initial preparation programs that certify educators for public school employment. Some, but not all, of them result from the need for regular teachers and administrators to educate handicapped children. Other pressures for change result from larger societal and school changes in recent years.

It is hard to separate the changes related to Public Law 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped Children Act) from other recent ones. The need to alter preservice programs to prepare educators for responsibilities with handicapped students is just one small piece in a giant puzzle. Preservice programs should be changed to meet a wide range of new needs. A brief summary of broad training needs will be presented first.

Preservice Teacher Education Needs to Change

Last summer Erma Bombeck wrote a column entitled "At Wits End" that described teacher burnout. She recounted a conversation with her friend Sylvia, a third grade teacher, who complained about stress related to hassles with children, sheer exhaustion, and lack of appreciation for her work. Bombeck told Sylvia that she used to have the same problems as a parent, until the schools assumed responsibility for many of her problems.

"I used to go crazy every morning telling the kids what to wear. Then we got the school to set up a dress code and THEY got the hassle." She described the relief she felt when the schools took over nutrition, sex education, physical fitness, values and discipline. "And I can't tell you what a relief it was when we dumped driver's education on the school. That can throw you into early menopause."

Erma's friend replied, "That's fine for you, but how do I get relief?"

"You spell it, P-A-R-E-N-T-S", said Erma.

The column is typical of these in which Bombeck combines rib-tickling humor with biting truth. The truth is that pressures related to rapid and unsettling changes in American society have resulted often in legislative mandates that place responsibility for problem solution on the public schools.

Higher education institutions which prepare educators for public school employment simply have not kept pace with change, nor had the hool time or financial resources to do so. Preservice education needs massive, comprehensive change; the patchwork approach simply may not be enough.

The P.L. 94-142 mandate, new responsibilities in areas such as career education, multicultural, environmental, drug and alcohol education all exert pressure for changes in preservice education. Often colleges have responded by adding one more course or squeezing in another lecture in an already crowded schedule. Broader changes affect schools ad children. For example

1) Families have changed. It is estimated that 45 percent of children born in 1976 will live before they reach age 18, with a single parent for some time. Sixteen to 18 percent of the U.S. population moves every year. In many two-parent families both must work, sometimes leaving children alone. Almost 500,000 children were placed in foster homes in the mid-1970's because of child abuse or abandonment.

2) Pressures on children have increased. The rate of juvenile crime is alarming. Even in a relatively safe place like Kentucky, 50,000 juveniles were arrested during 1977 and 1978. In the quiet, middle-sized city of Lexington, 238 children under 10 years of age were

arrested for serious offenses such as murder, rape, aggravated assault and auto theft in 1978. Add to this the realities of narcotics, truancy, teen-age pregnancy and childhood depression and one get an idea that the world of Walton's Mountain is gone forever. Today's youth face many of the same pressures that used to be viewed as adult problems.

3) Pressures on teachers and administrators also have increased. Nine of ten respondents to a recent National Education Association survey said that: teaching made more demands on their time and energies than they had expected, discipline was harder to achieve, and hours were longer. The average teacher puts in 47.4 hours weekly on the job, with secondary teachers, single women, and "mainstream" teachers spending more than that. Today's administrator is faced with added pressures from parents, special interest groups, and mounting paperwork to document programs. The pressures of long hours and low salaries are compounded by too many students and sometimes even student assault.

Because of present conditions in the public schools, educators need to be better prepared. Better preparedness requires massive changes in preservice programs.

One pressing need for change is related directly to the education of all handicapped students in the "least restrictive environment," as required by P.L. 94-142. There should be three kinds of related competencies added to all preservice programs for teachers and administrators: 1) development of positive attitudes toward students with special needs, 2) acquisition of knowledge about the law and learning needs of handicapped students, and 3) development of skills needed to direct or implement programs to meet these special needs. The first two competencies are essential for both teachers and administrators at all levels. The third competency differs for teachers, administrators, by grade level, and subject area in which an educator works. A rationale is presented next for adding each of these competency areas.

Positive Attitudes Toward Students with Special Needs

Regular educators with new responsibilities for handicapped students need to have positive attitudes toward those with special needs. Studies show that such attitudes can be learned in carefully designed preservice programs. Educators with positive attitudes can teach them to nonhandicapped students in schools where handicapped students are integrated. It is important for teachers and administrators to set this kind of example for students now that the handicapped are part of the mainstream of education.

Until the mid-1970's, American children had little opportunity to learn about handicapped children since most were excluded from public schools, considered too different to be educated with "normal" classmates. Some children developed feelings of awkwardness about handicapped persons. Because there was little chance for nonhandicapped children to interact naturally with handicapped children in public schools, many began to "learn" that in their society handicaps were to be pitied or hidden. As a result, some children were unsure about how to react when they saw a handicapped person in a store or on the street. They asked questions such as "What do I say to someone who is blind?," "Why is that person in a wheel chair allowed in this store?," Why are there no people in wheel chairs in my school?."

Before P.L. 94-142, many educators believed that service to the handicapped was outside of their scope of responsibility, because the law permitted schools to exclude these children from a free public education. Part of the attitude problem, then, was due to a lack of experience, exposure, and opportunity to develop positive attitudes.

How, can positive attitudes be developed? This law restates that no citizen in a democracy may be denied quality of opportunity, and some researchers have found that knowledge of the law is the factor most responsible for teachers' favorable attitudes toward developing individual programs for handicapped students. When teachers are aware of what they must do, they accept it. There is some evidence that preservice training on how to deal with handicapped children can improve regular administrators' and teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming.

How important is it for preservice programs to produce educators who accept individual differences? There are indications that teachers' attitudes toward children are expressed in their actions and are understood by other students. Teachers behave differently toward children depending upon their expectation levels. They expect more from children they think will do well, but accept poor work from and give less praise to children from whom they expect little. It is important for educators to have positive attitudes toward handicapped students, and these attitudes can be developed in preservice programs.

Knowledge about Law and Special Learning Needs

Teachers and administrators need to develop a basic knowledge of the laws and of special learning needs. All educators need to understand the basic legislation, what legal rights and responsibilities are, so they can protect the rights of handicapped children in their classes. Administrators need to know more about the law, since they must see that it is implemented throughout their buildings or districts.

Teachers and administrators also need to know what legal decisions are being made. Lawsuits in behalf of handicapped students help to clarify requirements of the law. A recent court decision (Larry P. v Riles) for example, resulted in an order to re-evaluate all of California's minority group children who may have been misplaced on the basis of biased intelligence tests in classes for the retarded. Educators need to know that ongoing legal interpretations clarify the law's intent, and that there is a need to keep current.

Educators need to learn what the law does not require. It does not require all handicapped students to be placed in regular classes for an entire day. It states that handicapped students must have access to equal opportunity, and that they should be placed in the education setting which best meets their needs and is most nearly normal (not a residential institution when a day-school would suffice, for example.) The law does not require the classroom teacher to meet all of the needs of a handicapped child, even if the child is placed part time in a regular class. It states that a "total service plan" should be designed. Outside help, from speech therapists, interpreters for the deaf or teacher aides, for instance, should be written into the plan when necessary. Perhaps this is the most important item which educators need to know about the law: it requires them to work together in providing for the special child's education.

All teachers and administrators need basic kinds of information to enable them to serve as sensitive leaders in schools which include handicapped students. Teachers, of course, require more specific knowledge about special learning needs, while administrators require more information on topics such as building codes. Basic knowledge of special learning needs can help prevent thinking a handicapped student is "just being lazy or stubborn," or that all similarly handicapped students are identical.

They need to know:

1. that some children with learning difficulties may not be able to sit still and listen for long periods of time, that they may have difficulty remembering what they learn, or that they seem to learn best when they can use concrete materials;
2. that children with hearing difficulties cannot read lips when a speakers' back is toward the window and the sun is causing a glare;

3. how to help a blind student find things in a new room by describing the room and relating directions to the face of the clock (for example, "the door is straight ahead of you at twelve o'clock.");
4. that restroom doors which are too narrow or ramps which are too steep are impossible for students in wheelchairs; and
5. that all handicapped students have strengths as well as weaknesses.

Such knowledge can help educators understand that handicapped students are persons with some special needs, not so completely different that they cannot be educated in public schools.

Skills Required by Teachers and Administrators

While both teachers and administrators need positive attitudes and basic knowledge about the handicapped, each group needs slightly different skills in preservice training. Teachers in various subject areas or at different grade levels need some unique kinds of skills in order to work effectively with handicapped students.

Teachers. Much is known about skills that are important for effective teaching with "regular" and exceptional students. In many cases, the same skills are important for both groups because each student is a special individual.

One of the most widely accepted lists of common knowledge required by all teachers working with handicapped students need to know comes from the National Support Systems Project directed by Dr. Maynard Reynolds, University of Minnesota-Minneapolis. This project supports the activities of 141 "Dean's Grants" (small federal grants to help deans in colleges of education plan and implement changes in preservice programs) in 46 states.

The ten "competency clusters," those skills agreed upon as being important for all teachers that work with handicapped students, are summarized below:

1. Curriculum - All teachers should study curriculum principles, and guides from preschool through secondary levels. This study should include practice in designing and modifying curriculm for individual needs.
2. Teaching Basic Skills - The preparation of all teachers should include competency in teaching basic skills. These include literacy, life maintenance, and personal development.
3. Class Management - All teachers should be able to manage groups and individuals in classrooms.
4. Professional Consultation and Communications - All teachers should master effective consultation ad other forms of communication.
5. Parent-Teacher Relationships - All teachers should have skills and sensitivity in dealing with parents and families of handicapped students.
6. Student-Student Relationships - All teachers should be able to manage the classroom environment in ways that include cooperative groups, peer and cross-age tutoring.
7. Exceptional Conditions - All teachers should have preparation in understanding exceptional children and in school roles and procedures for the specialists who serve them.

8. Referral - All teachers need to learn how to refer students for special help, including how to make observations that support their reasons for referral.

9. Individualized Teaching - All teachers should be competent in assessment of the student's educational needs and in adapting instruction to the individual.

10. Professional Values - All teachers should learn to value individual students, their needs and rights.

Elementary teachers do require some new skills to mainstream handicapped students, but essentially they need to develop and practice the skills that are important for all good teachers. During my recent third grade teaching experience I concluded that the educational needs of young handicapped and "normal" children were more alike than different. I learned that a classroom teacher could manage a class with such varied needs, and that the competencies just mentioned were important ones. In addition, I observed that the presence of handicapped children in a class helped other students to understand individual differences; that a classroom teacher can best aid handicapped students by helping them to become as much a part of the regular routine as possible, rather than by singling them out for special instruction. Another important skill is the ability to try different approaches and to make careful observations about which ones work. Moreover, I observed that a teacher needs to be able to work with others as part of a professional team with shared responsibility for a child's education.

It is important to emphasize that elementary classroom teachers do not need a completely new set of skills, but they do need skills at a highly professonal level. A regular teacher does not need to know, for example, how to teach a blind child to read. A regular teacher does need to be able to integrate some handicapped students into some classroom activities and to help them to be accepted. A blind child can participate in class discussion or work with a partner who can read assignments aloud.

Secondary teachers who have handicapped children in their classes need some new skills because high school education is more specialized than elementary. For example, a physical education teacher needs to know how to include handicapped children in sports and games. This is a matter of adapting activities for a student's special needs and also of understanding that the handicapped student can learn and enjoy physical activities and should not be left out. A home economics teacher needs to know how to integrate the handicapped student into consumer education, money management, nutrition, recycling household items, to provide highly specialized instruction. A history teacher does not need to be able to teach a mentally retarded student to read, but ought to be able to recognize problems that signal difficulties and to make appropriate referrals. A secondary teacher should know that an extremely short attention span, poor memory or comprehension, unreadable handwriting, weird spelling, failure to finish assignments or to participate in classroom activities may be signs of more serious problems.

Administrators both at the district and building-level need some new skills. They need to understand the legal requirements of handicapped children who live in their district and to insure that the rights of these children are protected. Such protection is fostered through nonbiased assessment, communication in the native language, appropriate placement in special programs, or writing of an educational plan. An administrator does not need to do these things, but he or she needs to understand that they need to be done, and to provide the resources to ensure that they are done. The administrator also should know about essential architectural changes needed in school buildings, such as installation of ramps and restrooms to accomodate wheel chairs.

Superintendents and other district-level administrators need special skills to assume their new responsibilities for educating the handicapped. Bank Street College of Education, through a series of special seminars for school district superintendents from the New York City metropolitan area, has outlined some of the skills and duties required of persons at this administrative level. They suggest that the superintendent be able to do the following:

1. Promote and represent developing trends and issues which affect schools;
2. Provide and support staff development programs which help staff to work together in meeting needs of handicapped;

3. Encourage and support the development of appropriate learning environments for handicapped children;
4. Provide assistance to school personnel in understanding a variety of assessment instruments and procedures;
5. Plan and implement new structures which permit cooperation with home and school community;
6. Understand and communicate architectural limitations and advantages of buildings;
7. Understand personal attitudes toward handicapped individuals as well as personal levels of strength and weakness;
8. Accept responsibility for compliance with the laws.

Principals need many of the same skills, but their role is building-specific. Some programs which have attempted to identify the skills needed for building-level administrators are those at the Universities of Vermont, Nebraska, and North Florida. It is difficult to say that training programs for principals are strictly "pre"service, since many obtain advanced degrees while already serving on the job. The National Association for State Directors of Special Education also has developed a list of skills needed by principals. Some key ideas from all four of these sources are summarized below. The principal needs to be able to:

1. Assure that the law is implemented and the rights of handicapped students are protected;
2. Plan for special education programs in schools and make budget recommendations to the superintendent;
3. Supervise personnel serving handicapped children in schools;

4. Arrange for an evaluation system to place special children appropriately and measure their progress;
5. Provide leadership in cooperative planning, decisionmaking, conflict resolution in programs for handicapped; and
6. Provide time and resources to support efforts of staff working with handicapped students.

Perhaps one of the most important skills needed by a principal is also the hardest to define. A four-year study of several hundred federally-funded programs designed to encourage innovative programs in public schools suggests that the building principal has an extremely important role in encouraging and supporting program change. The principal has been identified also as the key to whether mainstreaming works in a particular school. It seems that those principals with positive attitudes toward change, the ability to communicate its importance, and to support efforts of the faculty, are the most effective in bringing about building-level changes such as those required for educating handicapped students.

Summary: Need for Revision in Preservice Programs

There is increasing support for change in preservice training from within the ranks of educators. Both the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) have conducted recent conferences and written guidelines for members on the teacher's role in educating exceptional students. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education has indicated support and provided leadership for such change. The differences in the range of learning needs they include, the backgrounds of students, the problems they face, create needs for change in the preparation of teachers and administrators. The integration of handicapped students into more nearly "normal" programs has intensified the need for revision in the preservice programs of regular educators. But this one change cannot be separated from many others which, in aggregate, suggest that preservice preparation is in need of massive reform.

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION RESPONSE TO NEEDS OF CHANGE

Colleges and universities have responded to the need for change in a number of ways. Some institutions have been quite effective in working closely with state departments of education to plan changes, and have developed field-based programs with the help of local districts. Many colleges have added or changed courses or developed new content for preservice programs. A few have begun to change their entire programs. Some examples are given below:

A. Higher Education/State Agency Plans for Change

It is important that state departments of education and higher education institutions cooperate closely to develop new preservice programs. Every state department, in its annual program plan, must include a description of the number and type of education personnel needed to serve handicapped students in the state. The plan also has to describe the state's comprehensive program for preservice and inservice training to prepare these personnel. Input from higher education, as well as local agencies, parents, and other groups is required. Higher education institutions need to work closely with state departments in preservice program revision, to ensure that certification requirements are met and duplication of effort is avoided.

While a number of states have done this well, only a few will be mentioned.

- Texas had one of the first well-developed comprehensive systems for personnel development.
- In Oregon, the University faculty worked first with the state standards and practices committee, then developed a new preservice program.
- At the University of Idaho, learning packages for teachers on topics such as classroom management and communicating with parents have been developed. These are being tested by the Idaho State Department of Education.
- Pennsylvania, with initial leadership from Duquesne University, has outlined a state program of courses for regular educators working with handicapped students. This program will be used state-wide.

Cooperation between state departments of education and higher education is necessary and logical, but not always easy. The state agency for teacher certification is not the same as the one for special education; communication is often slow; and, sometimes a college may wish to change a program, but the cost is prohibitive.

B. Higher Education/Local Education Agency Cooperative Programs

The Universities of North Carolina, Kentucky, Washington, and Peabody College (new part of Vanderbilt University) are among the higher education institutions which have developed preservice programs with help from local education agencies.

- The North Carolina elementary education program includes a practicum in which preservice students work with handicapped children in schools.
- At Peabody the emphasis was on joint planning between college faculty and representatives of the public school system to design, implement, and evaluate preservice programs.
- At the University of Kentucky, public school personnel have been involved in the redesign of preservice programs since 1975.

The leave of absence I took from the University of Kentucky faculty to teach in a public school classroom was part of this cooperative program. The purpose of my field placement was to enable me to observe mainstreaming-related problems in elementary classrooms and to develop workable solutions for them.

C. Changes/Additions in Courses and Programs

A large number of institutions of higher education have changed their preservice programs by adding or modifying some of their coursework. A few examples include the following:

- *Colorado State University* has emphasized changes in its preservice secondary teacher education program. The program includes regular academic subjects, industrial arts, career-vocational education, and physical education programs. Preservice secondary teachers have opportunities for supervised work with handicapped students in a variety of settings, such as in home economics classes and wheelchair sports.
- The *University of Missouri-Columbia* and *University of Wisconsin-Whitewater* are among those that have experimental programs for small groups of regular educators. Their trainees specialize in learning to work with exceptional children in regular classes. These programs feature a block of special coursework on identifying, managing and instructing handicapped children.
- The *University of Nebraska* has developed a leadership program for preparing administrators to assume responsibility for education of handicapped students.
- *Augustana College* (South Dakota) is one of the institutions that has designed specific content to develop positive attitudes toward handicapped students. Among other things, this institution holds a "faculty awareness" day on its campus. This includes simulations in which faculty members experience the frustrations of being blind, in a wheelchair, or otherwise handicapped.

- Some colleges have developed modules and materials for use in their preservice courses. For example, the University of Northern Colorado has developed a series of units of instruction; University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee has developed a series of video tapes on handicaps; Indiana University's Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped has a variety of games, simulations, and mediated training packages for regular educators.

D. Planned Changes in Entire Preservice Education Programs

There is a growing feeling among professionals that changes in preservice programs should not continue as a patchwork response to immediate needs. They should, instead, be comprehensive, well-planned, and include an increase in the preparation time required for initial certification from 4 years to 5 or 6 years perhaps with a one-year internship. In February, 1980, at least 22 of the largest universities involved in teacher education had started to move in this direction. Leaders in the NEA and AFT support efforts to develop preservice programs which produce beginning teachers who can perform at a professional level. Three examples of efforts to move in this direction are summarized below. The second two suggest programs which would extend beyond four years, while the first example proposes coordinated revision of the existing four-year program.

- The College of St. Teresa (Winona, Minnesota) has initiated a preservice curriculum modification planned in three stages over three years. During the first year, the college held a workshop with faculty on needs of handicapped children in regular classes. The project director audited classes of other faculty, and faculty met for three hours each month. In the second year, faculty ideas given during a summer workshop resulted in reduction of course duplication and addition of content on the handicapped in several key areas. During year three, procedures will be refined and the competency of students will be measured during their practicum experiences.

- At the *University of Kansas*, an extended preservice program is nearly ready for implementation. It started with help from the Dean's Grant. Faculty from all areas of education held a series of workshops, developed activities, produced modules and materials for training teachers to educate the handicapped. Faculty members integrated these materials into their own regular education courses, then evaluated and revised them. This faculty group served as a resource and support system for other faculty. Their efforts led ultimately to an awareness that total program revision, and an extension of preservice time, was needed.
- The plan to revise and expand preservice programs at the *University of Florida* is called "Proteach." There are several reasons for the present emphasis on preservice revision in Florida. These include recent legislative mandates of entrance exams for all students in teacher education; a teacher competency exam for certification; and (after 1981) a

> year-long internship before certification. There is an awareness also that the professional needs of beginning teachers are much broader than can be met in present preservice programs. (More hours of professional training are required to become a barber in Florida than to become a Florida teacher.)

Planning for this program revision has involved faculty from all departments plus school participants from seven counties and state education department personnel. To date the planning group has identified areas of skills needed by all beginning teachers. The goals of "Proteach" are to redesign the Florida preservice program for professionals of the future; to prepare college level teacher educators for the future; to develop school and university centers where preservice students and faculty can study and practice the science and art of teaching. The plan is to test and develop parts of this program, and eventually to put the whole program into place.

Summary: Higher Education Responses to Needs for Preservice Revision

A large number of postsecondary institutions are changing, or are planning to change their preservice programs to prepare teachers and administrators for new responsibilities in educating handicapped students. Several examples have been given.

It is difficult to bring about change in higher education or elsewhere; it takes time for careful thought, time often unavailable for faculty members who must continue to teach existing courses while designing new ones. Change takes money for new materials, better school-based teaching laboratories, more careful supervison of preservice teachers' and administrators' performance. Yet change is taking place, and change with added quality control in preservice programs is important enough to deserve the support of professionals and of policymakers.

CONCLUSION

A purely programmatic approach might suggest that teachers be prepared on-the-job instead of in colleges and universities. Ironically, it was my experience as a third grade teacher rather than on my regular job as a college professor that convinced me of the importance of the higher education institution in preservice training. As a front-line teacher, I was overwhelmed by the problems of the moment, meeting the needs of individual handicapped children in a large group setting. I could think only of surviving each day, and had little time to plan for making the next day better. Preservice teachers need this kind of real-world experience. They also need to see that teaching and learning can be better than they are, and this takes some help from the researchers, planners, developers on college campuses. Providing the best possible education for all of America's students, including those who are handicapped, is the shared responsibility of many groups and individuals. Success will require collaboration among higher education, state and local education agencies, and policymakers.

Chapter 7

COMPREHENSIVE PERSONNEL AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT IN EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION: A PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

by

Robert F. Moore

INTRODUCTION

In this last quarter of the 20th century, legislation has been passed which with subsequent litigation requires schools to broaden their defininitions of education to include a commitment to populations who may never reach traditional standards of literacy, economic usefulness, social adjustment, and self-care. Public school systems have been mandated to assume responsibilities which were once the province of the homes of the pupils they served. With this expansion of roles has come a redefinition of public education. These new demands also signal the need for better preparation of school system personnel and a rethinking of the resources needed to implement the accompanying tasks.

Currently federal regulations, state mandates and local policies emphasize the need for a partnership in the delivery of education services to exceptional pupils between personnel preparation institutions and school systems. This has been a limited partnership, developed with much difficulty. Rarely has such interaction incorporated conjoint planning of programs, staff development, and the allocation and utilization of resources.

As fiscal resources diminish in supply, state boards of education and institutions of higher education (IHE) are encouraged to work together toward implementing a comprehensive system of personnel development in special education. Some ways in which these two systems can work together to precipitate innovative but realistic changes for special education will be suggested here. Three major areas which demand particular attention are: preservice training, inservice education and comprehensive program planning.

ISSUE: PRESERVICE EDUCATION

A. Recommendation is made that state boards of education should:

- Encourage institutions of higher education to participate in establishing minimum standards for all personnel involved in the education of mildy handicapped pupils;
- Re-examine the preparation of personnel in exceptional student education;
- Encourage collaboration with institutions of higher education to develop new models and alternative approaches to exceptional student education personnel certification standards.

One of the primary functions of institutions of higher education in teacher education is to prepare instructional personnel to work in local school districts. State boards of education should encourage the participation of these institutions in establishing minimum standards in their respective states for regular and exceptional student personnel. To do this state boards need to re-examine certification standards. The redefinition of regular education personnel roles requires that all education personnel have specific training in the identification, diagnosis, instruction, and management of mildly handicapped pupils. These pupils should be the primary responsibility of regular education personnel with special educators having only minimum contact with them.

In an era of fewer financial resources to educate mildy handicapped pupils in special settings, state boards of education must establish minimum preservice education standards for all personnel that include specific coursework and field experiences in the education of such students. These minimum standards should require regular and exceptional student education personnel to engage in conjoint planning to implement the above proposals.

State boards must re-examine the preparation of personnel in exceptional student education as well. For too long the leadership in states and teacher preparation institutions have viewed pupils with special needs in separate categories and the planning, development, and implementation of programs for them has redescribed this. There are more similiarities than differences between exceptional students and their regular peers in terms of their educational characteristics and needs, and the same is true across categories of exceptional pupils. Existing differences typically are frequency, duration, or intensity of behaviors. Though research and educational practices support these practices, many certification standards still require that personnel be trained according to categorical models. State boards should work with institutions of higher education to develop different approaches to the certification of personnel to work with exceptional pupils. Such new standards should emphasize interrelatedness across categories of exceptionality and be based upon the actual roles personnel are required to perform. Exemplary models exist in California, Massachusetts, and Minnesota.

ISSUE: INSERVICE EDUCATION

A. Recommendation is made that state boards of education should:

- Establish minimum standards for regular and exceptional education personnel;
- Require collaborative planning with institutions of higher education and school district personnel.

Although inservice education is not the primary mission of colleges and universities, personnel in these institutions constantly are requested to assist school districts in their efforts to retrain and renew personnel. Often approaches to inservice and preservice education are so vastly different that those being trained are caught in the middle, not knowing what to do next. If more systematic, consistent, and fiscally efficient approaches to the preparation of personnel are indicated, then state boards should establish minimum standards in the inservice education plans for regular and exceptional student education personnel. Collaborative planning and service delivery is advocated with institutions of higher education and school district personnel.

ISSUE: COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM PLANNING

A. Recommendation is made that state boards of education should:

- Enter into a partnership with institutions of higher education to address issues related to quality of programs and delivery of services for exceptional pupils.

Since the inception of Public Law 94-142 and other mandates pertaining to full delivery of services to exceptional pupils, state boards as well as school districts have engaged in many compliance activities to the neglect of program quality concerns. This has led to adversarial positions being taken between the parties concerned. With a movement away from simple compliance to issues of quality, institutions of higher education and state boards could enter into a partnership designed to address the quality of programs and services being delivered to exceptional pupils. Some specific areas in which institutions of higher education could assist state boards to develop an improved system of comprehensive program planning are as follows:

1. Better Collection of Needs Assessment Data. In order to make better decisions about the types of programs and services that should be available to exeptional pupils, data are needed which provide the following information:
   (a) number of students by age and by program in each local district;
   (b) number of students by secondary service and by cost;
   (c) certification of teacher by student;
   (d) expertise of university training personnel.

   Collection and use of such information could help state boards make better decisions about the types of programs and services needed in the education of exceptional pupils. Institutions of higher education could assist state boards and local school districts in the collection and use of these data.

Preservice and inservice education programs could then be developed to meet critical manpower shortages in such areas as speech and hearing, and in low incidence areas. State boards could involve colleges and universities in long-range planning and provide encouragement to postsecondary institutions and school districts engaged in local planning. These activities could assist state boards decisionmaking on appropriate locations for personnel preparation programs.

2. Program Review and Evaluation. State boards could request the assistance of institutions of higher education in state program review and evaluation activities. Specifically, higher education personnel could serve as members of district auditing and monitoring teams. In this way, higher education institutions could obtain direct feedback from districts about personnel preparation needs. Postsecondary personnel also could be utilized to provide on-site technical assistance to district and state personnel in the delivery of services, use of program support services, and program development activities.

3. Conduct of Research. One of the primary missions of graduate institutions is to conduct research and thereby to advance and improve the knowledge base in education. Although many programs have been developed to deliver education to exceptional pupils in the least restrictive environment,

little research has been conducted either on the theoreical bases of some of our practices or on the effectiveness of the practices. State boards could engage in cooperative planning with institutions of higher learning to determine research areas to investigate that might assist in comprehensive personnel and program planning in exeptional student education. Some areas that need investigation are:

(a) effectiveness of parent training on the delivery of services to exceptional pupils;

(b) post-school adjustment of exceptional pupils;

(c) effectiveness of school-based versus district-based decision making on the quality of services for exceptional pupils;

(d) various models for delivering services to handicapped pupils in alternative and nondistrict programs;

(e) alternative approaches to screening, diagnosing, and placing students in exceptional student education programs.

SUMMARY

Two concepts remain central to the administrative functions of state boards of education: (1) establishment of minimum standards and (2) encouragement of local districts to exceed these minimums. In education, the "minimums" often tend to become "maximums". Nowhere is this more striking than in programs for exceptional students evidenced by the proliferation of state and local district documents on minimum performance standards. State boards should encourage school districts to set higher standards of performance and competence. Institutions of higher education can assist state boards in this process toward improving personnel and developing programs in exceptional student education.

Chapter 8
THE DELIVERY OF QUALITY INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

by

Patricia P. Kells

INTRODUCTION

Educational policymakers are under pressure to assure that programs which serve all students are cost beneficial and demonstate qualitative improvement. The purpose of this chapter is to provide ilustrations of quality practices in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of inservice education prorams. The term inservice education "programs" is carefully selected. "The activities of an inservice education program are considered to be a process by which educational personnel are, as a result of the process, continually prepared and updated with specific knowledge, skills, or the attitudes necessary to perform their role."[1] Ideally these activities are long-term rather than simply a series of unrelated "one-shot" efforts supported by only special interest or advocacy groups.

The process approach to inservice education recognizes the varied and evolving needs of the system and its personnel. The inservice education program initiates and supports effective change, based on an understanding of the change process. These characteristics asure an inservice program that enhances the skills of educational personnel.

---

[1] Kells, P. et. al. Quality Practices in Inservice Education, prepared for the National Advisory Board to the National Inservice Network, Indiana University, July, 1980

Such an approach begins with the: (1) identification of programmatic and individual needs; (2) planning, management, and implementation of inservice education programs; (3) ongoing evaluation; and (4) continuous needs assessment.

The focus of an effective inservice education program is on the stated goals of the system/school/classroom/individual in terms of student outcomes. This focus recognizes student needs, student involvement, and the impact upon students of inservice activities.

QUALITY PRACTICES

The Task Force on Quality Practices in Inservice Education of the National Advisory Board to the National Inservice Network has generated and validated statements of good practice in inservice programs. Their effort was supported by the Division of Personnel Preparation, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education. This section presents the criteria reported by the task force, and statements of quality inservice education practice currently used in several states as assessment criteria for local district programs. Some states use the statements to assist their monitoring of the degree to which the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development is implemented.

Quality practices in inservice education programs:

- recognize that programs must be integrated functionally into and supported by the existing organization;

- result in programs which are

    collaborative

    needs based,

    responsive,

- and are evaluated in ways which are compatible with the underlying philosophy and approach of the program.

Organizational Integration

A formally adopted written plan of inservice for a district or an agency should be prepared so that it describes all components of a comprehensive system. This plan can be used then as a basis for evaluation and ongoing planning, for communication and for building program support.

- The inservice education program is an integral part of the total organizational system within which it functions.
- Written policy exists to support the inservice education program.
- The assumptions and the theoretical rationale underlying the inservice program are explicitly stated.
- The inservice education program design describes the organizational role, responsibility and support for planning, implementation and evaluation of the program.
- Procedures exist to assure the program of adequate fiscal, material, staff and facility resources.
- Federal, state, and local policies pertaining to the inservice education program are studied by planning participants.
- Information about inservice activities is systematically communicated to all audiences concerned.

Collaborative

Collaborative approaches to inservice programs are the most effective. Such programs attend to the human needs of those served, and provide models of positive interaction skills. Including participants, students and the community in program planning, delivery and evaluation can result in increased motivation, strengthened support and maximal resources.

- The inservice education program provides opportunities for all school personnel to act as participants.
- Personnel from agencies involved or affected by the inservice education program are included in the planning process.
- All groups which are affected by the inservice education program, including parents and students, have a voice in decisions regarding the program.
- Inservice activities include students as teachers and learners whenever possible.
- Procedures exist to assure inclusion of community resources for the inservice education program.
- Participants and others affected by the inservice education program are major providers of data for evaluation.

Needs-Based

Inservice education is a support service for a total educational system. It draws its legitimacy from the contribution it makes to strengthening the system's programs and services for students.

- The inservice program design recognizes the importance of the participants' perceptions of need for the training proposed.
- An assessment of the strengths and needs of prospective participants and of the system is part of the inservice program design.

- Inservice program goals are derived primarily from a set of educational goals for students, including students with handicaps.
- Inservice content and strategies are drawn from, and designed to meet, the assessed needs of students, personnel, and organizations.
- Programs include activities to meet the needs of leadership personnel, with special attention to building principals.

Responsive

Responsive inservice training, built upon identified needs, meets those needs and is adaptive to changes in educational programs, personnel and conditions. It is planned and delivered in ways which incorporate sound principles of adult learning, recognize findings of research on innovation and change, and fit the nature and scope of the activity.

- The inservice program design defines a dynamic and continuous process that is flexible and responsive to changing needs and new requirements.
- Inservice activities are individualized, insofar as possible, to meet the needs and goals of participants.
- The inservice program design includes goals which are designed to reduce undue stress and to increase both competence and morale among program participants.
- Inservice providers are selected on the basis of their qualifications for specific tasks.
- Inservice activities make use of peer-teaching strategies and participant-created materials, whenever appropriate.
- On-site demonstrations with students are included when appropriate to the inservice education experience.

- Participants are provided with positive feedback on their progress and with follow-through consultation which is separate from the system's personnel evaluation procedures.
- Inservice activities are offered in a logical sequence and over a period of time.
- Inservice activities are planned and conducted with minimum interference to the students' ongoing instructional program.
- Inservice activities are conducted primarily during participants' normal working hours.
- Inservice activities are conducted, whenever possible, on the participants' work site.
- Inservice locations are selected to provide the most appropriate setting for the knowledge, skills and attitudes to be acquired and demonstrated.

Evaluation

Evaluation data can help determine the degree of effectiveness of professional development experiences. Ongoing evaluation also can be used to strengthen planning and implementation. Evaluation, the systematic collection of information about the context and operation of inservice programs, can be used to: (1) determine needs, (2) plan programs, (3) revise and redevelop activities, and (4) judge impact.

- Decisions concerning the inservice education program consider ongoing program evaluation by program participants and others affected by the program.
- The inservice program design includes both short-term and long-term goals.
- The inservice evaluation design is comprehensive and addresses the process components of planning, implementation, and dissemination.

- The inservice evaluation design is responsive to knowledge, skill, and affective outcomes.
- Data from evaluation is used for ongoing planning of the inservice program.
- The inservice education evaluation design is reliable and valid.
- The evaluation design includes plans to frequently report data on all major aspects of the program including impact on students, to all major audiences.
- The documentation of the impact of inservice activities should include the perceptions of students themselves whenever appropriate.

PROGRAM EXAMPLES

The application of quality practices in inservice education can be found in programs across the country. Following are descriptions of four practices being implemented in various educational settings.

1. Written policy exists to support the inservice education program. In Indiana, the Board of Trustees of the Monroe County Community School Corporation has adopted the following policy statement in support of the need for inservice education:

> "Teaching in a rapidly changing, techniologically-oriented society demands new competencies. Methods and materials become outmoded very quickly. In recognition of this fact, the Board of School Trustees shall provide opportunities for the professional staff to participate in an on-going program of inservice education. It shall be the responsiblity of the Superintendent of Schools to see that such a program is based on the existing needs of both the school system and the professional staff. Provision shall be made for representatives from the teaching and administrative staffs to plan cooperatively the inservice educational program."

Texas State Board of Education Policy 4104 governing the school year states that,

> "In addition to the 175 instruction days for professional and paraprofessional personnel, excepting clerical aides, a total of not less than 10 days in 1977-78 and 8 days in 1978-79 shall be allowed for inservice training and for preparation related to the instructional program of the district."
>
> "The school district may, at its discretion, count as a part of the days allowed for inservice training those instructional workshops planned by and/or sponsored by regional education service centers or the Texas Education Agency, but not more than one day of professional association meetings may be counted as an inservice day."
>
> "Not more than five of the 10 days may be used for preparation days. For the 1978-79 school year, not more than three of the eight days may be used for preparation days. Preparation days are defined as those on which pupils are not present and teachers are on duty in their assigned areas for such purposes as preparing for the beginning and ending of the school session, grading papers, or recording grades."

2. Procedures exist to assure a program of adequate fiscal, material, staff and facility resources. Unified School District #497, Lawrence, Kansas has allocated local funds for and developed a thorough description of its staff development program. A defined system of access to program resources exists and, description of the procedure to request staff development activities is included in the district handbook. This description defines the method for initiating a request as well as the approval process. The application form used requires the following information: the identified concern (reason for proposal), participants, specific objectives, estimated budget, requested support personnel, an evaluation design, a dissemination plan, follow-up activities and signatures of the submitter as well as the principal or appropriate director.

Michigan local personnel development activities are supported through legislative appropriations which are administered through the State Department of Education. Applicant districts are eligible to receive $25.00 per professional staff member or $35.00 when there are 750 or more professional staff. A consortium of districts may be established to reach the criterion of 750 staff.

The entitlement is available upon submission of an application to the Department of Education. Information required in the applications submitted includes: identification of the needs assessment, program goals and objectives, the process for program development and identification of resources, the evaluation process, designation of a policy board, program coordinator, legal fiscal agent; and a three-year plan which states priorities for the utilization of staff development funds.d

3. Inservice program goals are derived, primarily, from a comprehensive set of educational goals for students, including students with handicaps. The Bahia Vista School, San Rafael, California, annually validates major educational goals for all students, including those with handicaps, with the students themselves as well as with staff, parents, and other community members. At least three times annually (fall, winter, spring), each student, parent, and teacher are asked to rate and submit written comments on the student's progress toward each of these school/community goals.

The student/parent/teacher teams then meet together to plan needed objectives, means, and shared responsibilities for further progress. Shortly after this conference, each teacher receives computer printouts that summarize the written data for the class and for the school. One printout highlights students who are not making adequate progress, their needs, and specific types of assistance they, their families, and teacher indicate are needed.

With the principal's help, everyone examines these results individually and as a school "family" to plan individual and group means for principal, staff, parent, community, and student development programs. Each round of three-way evaluations and conferences provides student-change data for evaluating previous efforts and for identifying current needs.

4. Inservice providers are seleced on the basis of qualifications for specific tasks. Within the Kansas State Department of Education a "Human Resources" file is maintained. Categories of expertise include behavior management, science and administration. There are directories of technical assistants in areas such as reading and special education Persons included in this file have been recommended by two others, submit a form which describes their specialization areas, the appropriate audience for their service(s), previous consulting experience, special competencies, their fee and scope of availability. When persons whose names are included in the Human Resources file perform services within the state, an evaluation form is submitted to the Department. The evaluations are kept as a part of the individual's file.

SUMMARY

Educational policymakers as well as practitioners seek qualitative measures for programs. When planning, implementing, or evaluating an inservice education program, a key element is the degree to which the program is comprehensive and integrated within the existing organization. An articulated system of support for the inservice education program through written policy, adequate procedures, and level of support is a primary goal.

A collaborative (not a cooptive) approach should be employed in all aspects of program planning, implementation, and evaluation. This approach recognizes the value of multiple sources of type of information but also generates strengthened support for the program among all personnel and the community.

The inservice program must be based on the identified needs of the system and act as one of the support services of the total organization. The needs of personnel for inservice training should be in relationship to their increased capability to strengthen the system's programs and services for students.

Responsive inservice education recognizes the evolving needs of the system, personnel, and relevant research. It incorporates sound principles of adult learning and is delivered in a manner which is appropriate to the intended purpose.

The evaluation component of the inservice program should be compatible with the general philosophy and approach employed. Evaluation should be used to strengthen planning and implementation as well as to determine the degree of program effectiveness.

Students of quality practice in inservice education programs may be used to assess the degree of their qualitative comprehensiveness or used as a monitoring tool. They may be used to increase awareness, knowledge, or skills of planners, deliverers and recipients of inservice education. For a copy of the complete report of the Task Force of Quality Practices in Inservice Education contact: The National Inservice Network, 2853 East 10th, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Chapter 9
STRATEGIES FOR OVERCOMING MAJOR INSERVICE PROBLEMS

by

Stanley A. Fagen

INTRODUCTION

Public schools are expected to integrate handicapped children into the regular school program "to the maximum extent appropriate," as required by P.L. 94-142. This challenge cannot be met without effective inservice training and genuine collaboration between special and regular educators. As Edwin Martin stated, "If the majority of handicapped children . . . are to be spending most or much of their time in regular classrooms, there must be massive efforts to work with their regular teachers . . ." (1974. John Ryor noted that, ". . . results of our National Education Association survey indicated that the issues of greatest concern to teachers in connection with the passage of P.L. 94-142 are a lack of inservice and a lack of teacher time" (1978, p.7). The importance of local school training of regular educators is highlighted by the U.S. Office of Special Education's recent report indicating that resistance to mainstreaming in school districts was often overcome by responsive inservice training (Education of the Handicapped, 1979).

It is clear that handicapped students are more likely to succeed in the mainstream when the teacher has developed skills for classroom accommodations (e.g., varying learning modality, adjusting pace, structuring for cooperative interaction, varying channels for task completion), (Redden & Blackhurst, 1978; Raison, 1979; Hoben, 1980).

However, despite the recognition of need for training to assure positive mainstreaming there is much concern that practical inservice is falling behind the rush to place handicapped children in "least restrictive environments" (Martin, 1976; NEA Panel, 1978; Prehm and McDonald, 1979; Reynolds, 1979). Two main hurdles are particularly difficult to overcome: (1) institutions of higher education are embedded in existing on-campus teacher education delivery models and reinforcers (Corrigan, 1978; Mercer, Forgnone and Beattie, 1978; Stedman, 1979), and (2) local education agencies lack strategies and resources to directly support on-the-job professional development of classroom teachers (Hawkins-Shepard, 1978; Wieck, 1979; Fussell, Landy and Mainzer, 1980).

This chapter confronts the second of these hurdles by identifying effective inservice strategies for overcoming major sources of difficulty. A variety of strategies are suggested based upon experience gained conducting inservice training for mainstreaming during the past five years in Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS), Maryland.

STRATEGIES FOR OVERCOMING MAJOR INSERVICE PROBLEMS

The overt clamor for inservice training has all to often been accompanied by large-scale disillusionment and frustration. Such training requires careful thought and planning. It cannot be provided in a slap-dash, haphazard manner. To assure a positive foundation for inservice, three major problems must be considered:

1. The perceived need for inservice by educators and policymakers versus the limited funding available to local education agencies,
2. The perceived need for inservice for mainstreaming versus competing community priorities, and
3. The stated need for inservice versus the natural obstacles presented by staff "learners."

Problem #1 - Perceived need for inservice by educators and policymakers versus limited funding available.

Feedback from classroom teachers and administrators consistently reflects concern about available time and energy for the demanding set of educational tasks required for effective mainstreaming (NEA Panel, 1978; Herda, 1980; Prince and Goodman, 1980). On the whole, educators have not denied the responsibility or philosophical appropriateness for a "mainstreaming ideal." However, there are strong doubts and apprehensions about the feasibility of implementing this ideal, given present levels of human and material resources, teacher skills, and help immediately available.

In the Montgomery County Public Schools, a recently completed survey of 185 regular teachers indicated that: (1) over 50 percent were not sure whether "the benefits of placing special children in the regular classrom are worth the overall effort required;" (2) 80 percent agreed that "inservice training is needed for regular teachers to be successful in teaching handicapped students." Unfortunately, training support lags far behind this perceived need. For example, based on close involement with six major public school systems, the Special and General Education Leadership Project (1976-1979), funded by the U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH), found that "inservice educators now have less time and fewer resources with which to work than during any recent period in educational history." (Herda, 1980).

It has become clear that the worthwhile goals of the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development will not be accompanied by an infusion of substantial new monies for personnel and materials. At the same time local education agencies are at a crosspoint of "rising expectations with reducing costs." A realistic set of countering strategies is needed to expand or improve educational services and support more inservice activity at the LEA level.

Strategies

1. Keep inservice expectations realistic and reasonable. Staff should not be addressed in punitive ("you'll have to shape up now and stop dumping kids into special classes") or rosy ("you're fortunate to participate in an era of equal opportunity for handicapped kids") terms. Instead, inservice trainers must adopt a reality-based position ("it won't be easy to reach the level of individualization which the law calls for").

2. *Expectations for change in teacher behavior should follow a "stretching" principle* rather than one based on "remaking" or "replacing" people. Nothing is more absurd than presenting a one day inservice program as if it will "give you the skills to deal with these kids." On the other hand, regular teachers can accept and apply themselves to the task of "adding or reinforcing some options," within the same time frame.

3. *Build on existing strengths and resources*. Trainers should involve school staff in the design and implementation of inservice programs, including use of local talent for mini-presentations, small group leadership and illustration of methods or techniques that have worked. This strategy is crucial to the ultimate success of inservice training (Waldron, 1980). Sessions which address a single topic or skill must allow opportunities for small group sharing or problem solving so that more competent teachers can assist peers where appropriate. A particularly useful format is one in which school staff pair with the area or central office staff, or outside consultants, to conduct skill sessions.

4. *Get "mileage" out of program development*. It is wasteful to start new programs without considering either their relationship to existing resources or their potential for longer-term utilization. Since inservice training is best conducted close to the building level and by personnel that are knowledgeable about practical teacher needs, it is *important to harness external consultation for the purpose of developing internal self-sufficiency*. School systems need to identify

internal talent who can accept increasing levels of responsibility for inservice training over time, so that program maintenance can occur within the organization.

School system administrators should seek long-term commitments for the continuation of successful programs by spelling out future implications in program proposals, making formal and informal progress reports, involving community and professional associations in advisory capacities, and assuring program integration within the superintendent's budget. Perhaps the most powerful means of enforcing program longevity is through arrangements of shared responsibility and funding with institutions of higher education, state departments of education and federal agencies.

A good example of getting mileage out of program development is Montgomery County Public School's Mark Twain Teacher Internship program, which began as an intensive, one-year master's level BEH innovative project (Fagen, 1977). Much of this program's competency-based training, designed to prepare regular educators for teaching students with emotional and learning disorders, is currently available to all classroom teachers through inservice courses, workshops, and individualized study modules (Fagen and Guedalia, 1977; Fagen and Hill, 1977).

Problem #2 - Perceived need for inservice for mainstreaming versus competing community priorities.

The enactment of Public Law 94-142 and its consequent impact toward least restrictive programming did not occur overnight. It has evolved during a ten year period from the steadfast efforts of concerned parent groups, the Council for Exceptional Children, and numerous court rulings. However, the mandate for mainstreaming handicapped students to the optimal extent possible has reached the public school level simultaneously with other compelling priorities. In MCPS the cries for "a return to basics," "effective discipline," "minority rights," "zero-based budgeting," "more classroom teaching and materials," and "programs for gifted and talented" are as loud as those for the education of all handicapped children. Each of these priorities can be considered in competition with support for mainstreaming unless strategies are identified which promote convergence and compatibility between and among community pressures.

Strategies:

1. Subsume the mainstreaming concept within a broader goal of achieving individualized instruction and mastery learning. The development and implementation of a formal Individualized Education Program for handicapped students should be regarded as a prerequisite for individualized instruction. Highlighting the IEP, as a process and as a product, has the following advantages:

   - it draws attention to ways in which teachers may select goals and objectives that are most basic for student needs;
   - it helps parents and educators see what alternative environments are best suited to different children;

- it promotes recognition that both academic and social-emotional needs must receive appropriate educational intervention;
- it indicates how special and regular educators can work together in planning classroom strategies and materials for individual students.

It is quite plausible that, in the long run, the results of individualized programming for handicapped students will directly benefit all children. As teaching staff gain confidence and experience in tailoring objectives, strategies and materials to exceptional students, they will be better able to accommodate the uniqueness of any student.

2. Conserve staff talent and continuity by retraining strong regular educators for resource roles in special education. Many regular teachers have outstanding potential to work with exceptional children and provide assistance to other classrom teachers. With additional training for certification in special education these teachers can bridge the gaps between special and regular education. This approach has been successfully employed in the Mark Twain Teacher Internship Program (Fagen, 1978). Since 1972, 115 regular teachers have been trained for redeployment in special education. Of these, 97 are currently serving Montgomery County Public Schools.

In addition to the advantages of nurturing local talent for personnel renewal and peer credibility, "recycling" top quality staff into special education resource positions provides a constructive alternative to laying off staff in surplus fields while, paradoxically, hiring new teachers into special education. Institutions of higher education should assign a priority to creating such retraining programs in collaboration with local education agencies.

3. Work with teacher associations to mobilize support for special education resource positions. In times of increasing educational austerity, it is not a simple matter to persuade school boards to fund positions which do not provide full-time direct instruction to students. Nevertheless, regular classroom teachers must receive help from special educators if mainstreaming is to become more than a dream. Teacher associations are sincere advocates for the well being of classrom teachers. Without their support, it is questionable whether resource roles will be sufficiently valued by school systems to survive budgetary constraints.

4. Embed inservice functions into special education resource positions. The most effective inservice training takes place within or close to the regular classroom, in the course of natural collaborative efforts. Special educators must have time to observe,

co-teach, demonstrate and consult in regular classrooms. In addition, the job descriptions of resource staff should include responsibilities for planning and conducting school-based inservice workshops and seminars.

5. Build inservice priorities into annual school objectives. It can be very demoralizing to staff and trainers to find that concientiously planned inservice programs are of secondary importance to school administration. Principals, flooded with a multitude of immediate concerns, should not be expected to protect or follow-up inservice activities unless efforts are made to involve them in establishing inservice objectives for their faculty. Most principals become invested in their school's annual objectives, and to the extent that inservice priorities are reflected in these objectives, genuine support from the administration can be anticipated. In effect, progress on annual school objectives constitutes a principal's "report card." Sample 1 presents a school inservice planning form which can facilitate this strategy.

6. Develop cooperative staff-parent inservice planning committees. The strongest and most persevering support for inservice for mainstreaming derives from the keen motivation of parents of children with special needs. Their concern and commitment to their child's success in the regular program creates an intense desire to promote teacher skill and awareness. Parent advocacy for the training of

Office of Continuum Education
In-Service Training Unit
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Montgomery County Public Schools
Area In-Service Lab for Mainstreaming

SAMPLE I
ANNUAL SCHOOL INSERVICE PLANNING FORM

School ______________________ In-Service Coordinator for Mainstreaming ______________________

In-Service Committee Members ______________________________ Date ______________________

Annual School Goals	Priority In-Service for Mainstreaming Objectives*	Planned Actions During Year	Resources	Timeline
Example: (1) Effective discipline	Examples: (1) Improve classroom methods for reinforcing behavior expectations.* (2) Enhance understanding of skills and needs of ID students.			

* In-service objectives may or may not be related to annual school goals; place asterisk next to those which are related.

regular classroom teachers is an absolute necessity for any long-term inservice effort. In addition, parents have a great deal to contribute in helping staff learn ways to accommodate and cope with handicapped children (Katz, Borten, Brasile, Meissner and Parker, 1980).

Problem #3 - Stated need for insevice versus natural obstacles presented by staff "learners". Many trainers are aghast when they overhear staff reactions to inservice sessions. Comments like "a bunch of Mickey Mouse" or "what a waste of time" can cut deeply, if one is serious about helping teachers through inservice training. Unfortunately, much activity characterized as inservice is, in fact, poorly planned and hastily executed. It is sad to think that sometimes the only redeeming feature seems to be that teachers become more conscious of how their students feel when instruction leaves them bored or frustrated.

Inservice trainers must recognize that several natural obstacles have to be overcome in conducting staff training:

- Strong negative expectations are often present regarding the potential value of inservice for practical classroom application.
- Teacher energy may be depleted, particularly when the program occurs after school.
- Staff enter an inservice session with many preoccupations resulting from incompleted tasks and unresolved student problems.

- Basic resentment often exists because staff have lacked prior involvement in determining the need or priorities for training. This is especially true when the inservice program has been mandated by outside forces.

Strategies:

1. Seek to match intensity of inservice training to learner need. Given the fact that teaching staff have varying levels of need and energy for training, it is important to create a range of inservice alternatives. Although all classroom teachers should be expected to participate in mainstreaming, few of them will opt for intensive, after-school training. Professional associations rightfully have sought to protect classroom teachers from any imposition of additional, non-contractual demands by insisting on extra inservice support and incentives. Of special importance is the development of inservice opportunities close to or within the regular teaching assignment. In effect, a continuum model is needed for inservice training as much as it is for services to students. Figure 1 depicts such a continuum of inservice training as applied in Montgomery County Public Schools.

2. Develop skilled specialists to provide inservice management and leadership for mainstreaming. Teacher specialists for inservice training are indispensable for implementation of a continuum of inservice training, as shown in Figure 1. At the present time, this type of specialized position rarely can be found in school systems.

TYPE OF INSERVICE TRAINING	STAFF RESPONSIBLE
8. Long-Term Intensive Training (Academic Leave)	University faculty or Continuum Education Teacher Intership Program faculty
7. University or Private Courses/Institutes	University or private agency faculty
6. MCPS Continuum Education Competency Courses	In-Service Training Unit, Continuum Education
5. Short-Term Intensive Training	Teacher Specialists for In-Service Training
4. Area & County Workshops/Special State & Local Workshops	Continuum Education Trainers/Consultants
3. Formal In-School Courses/Seminars/Individual Study	Teacher Specialists for In-Service Training/School In-Service Coordinator for Mainstreaming
2. In-School and Interschool Workshops/Informal Study Labs	Teacher Specialists for In-Service Training/School In-Service Committee Members
1. Consultation (Direct to Individual Staff or to IEP Team)	School In-Service Committee Members/Teacher Specialists & Area Resource Staff

Figure 1. Continuum of In-Service Training for Mainstreaming, Montgomery County Public Schools, Maryland

With assistance from the U. S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Montgomery County Public Schools conducted a three-year "supplementary education inservice trainer development program" to achieve the following objectives: identify and select outstanding supplementary education staff for preparation as inservice trainers; organize and conduct a competency-based program for development of inservice trainers; facilitate optimal utilization of these trainers during and following completion of the preparation program; establish and maintain inservice labs as a base of operation for supplementary education trainers.

To guarantee a high quality of professionalism for inservice training, this program included formal competency training and supervised practicuum experience in six areas: inservice needs assessment, school inservice and resources planning, school inservice instruction, individualized education programming, staff and educational management team consultation, and inservice evaluation.

3. *Identify local school staff to serve as inservice coordinators for mainstreaming*. Experience has shown that effective inservice at the building level requires active involvement of local school staff in planning, delivery, evaluation and follow-up. Establishing a formal role of School Inservice Coordinator for Mainstreaming is a pivotal link in the continuum of inservice training that assures necessary teaming between an in-school and out-of-school staff development resource (*i.e.*, teacher specialist for inservice training). Table 1 presents the responsibilities and qualifications

for the School Inservice Coordinator for Mainstreaming which are currently being used in Montgomery County Public Schools. It should be noted that responsibilities 3 - 6 must be performed outside the regular work assignment. Therefore, it is necessary that incentives such as paid stipends, course credits, or released time be created to support this role.

TABLE 1

RESPONSIBILITIES AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE SCHOOL INSERVICE COORDINATOR FOR MAINSTREAMING

RESPONSIBILITIES	QUALIFICATIONS
1. Chairs a school inservice for mainstreaming committee, with representation of regular and special education staff.	1. Highly recommended by principal.
2. Maintains liaison with school principal.	2. Respected by school faculty.
*3. Particpates in inservice coordinators meetings with teacher specialist for inservice training.	3. Demonstrated leadership and/or inservice training abilities.

TABLE 1 (Continued)

*4. Helps to implement inservice programs planned by the school inservice committee including (a) arranging for resources, (b) disseminating information, (c) assisting in design and instruction.	4. Tenured staff member with at least one year future commitment to the school.
*5. Participates in delivery of mainstreaming seminars, workshops and courses.	5. Demonstrated acceptance of mainstreamed students.
*6. Responsible for evaluation of inservice for mainstreaming activities.	6. Enrollment in or completion of some coursework related to

4. Adopt an assessment - prescription approach to school inservice programming. School staff need the opportunity to identify their own strengths and weaknesses through formal or informal assessment. The school inservice committee can facilitate gathering data on inservice needs and resources through team or faculty meetings, in cooperation with school administration.

Community and administration priorities for school improvement should become part of the assessment process so that balanced inservice planning can occur. For example, the staff of one elementary school gave a favorable self-assessment in managing student behavior while a vocal segment of the community complained about poor relationships among students. Given both data sources, it was possible to establish community - school communications as one school inservice priority, without negating other staff training objectives.

Following an assessment phase, the inservice for mainstreaming committee, with assistance from an out-of-school inservice trainer, can draft an annual inservice plan which responds to identified needs.

SUMMARY

Large sums of new dollars for additional positions will not be accompanying Public Law 94-142 and its quest for "least restrictive" education. Thus, a major hope for support to regular classroom teachers rests with effective inservice training. Before helpful outcomes can be expected from inservice training, care must be taken to build a basis for success. Presently, our aspirations for inservice far exceed our awareness and appreciation of the problems.

This paper has sought to promote realistic attitudes towards inservice for mainstreaming. Three significant inservice problems have been identified and related to funding limitations, competing community priorities, and obstacles presented by staff learners. As a result of experience gained from inservice practices in Montgomery County Public Schools, a variety of strategies have been suggested to help resolve these difficulties.

REFERENCES

Corrigan, D. Public Law 94-142: A matter of human rights - A call for change in schools and colleges of education. In *Teacher Education: Renegotiating Roles for Mainstreamins*, J. Grosenick and M. Reynolds (Eds), 17-29. Minneapolis, Minnesota: National Support Systems Project, 1978.

Education of the Handicapped newsletter, March 14, 1979, (6). Washingon, D.C.: Capitol Publications.

Fagen, S. Sustaining our teaching resources: A public school-based internship in special education. *In Field-Based Teacher Training: Applications in Special Education*, C. M. Nelson (ed), 83-111. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, Advanced Institue for Trainers of Teachers, 1978.

Fagen, S. *Organizational Manual for a Public School-Based Teacher Inernship Model in Supplementary Education*. Rockville, Maryland: Montgomery County Public Schools, 1977.

Fagen, S. and Guedalia, L. *Individual and Group Counseling: A Competency-Based Manual for In-service Training*. Washington, D.C.: Psychoeducational Resources, 1977.

Fagen, S. and Hill, J. *Behavior Management: A Competency-Based Manual for In-Service Training*. Washington, D.C.: Psychoeducational Resources, 1977.

Fussell, K. Landy, J. and Mainzer, R. *Level I: A Resource Manual for Program Developers*. Baltimore, Maryland: Maryland State Department of Education, 1980.

Hawkins-Shepard, C. Working with the IEP: Some early reports. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 1978, 10, 95-97.

Herda, E. Aspects of general education governances and P.L. 94-142 implementation. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, January, 1980, 1-12.

Hoben, M. Toward integration in the mainstream, *Exceptional Children*, October, 1980, 100-105.

Katz, S., Borten, J., Brasile, D., Meissner, M., and Parker, C. Helping parents become effective partners inthe IEP process. *The Pointer*, 1980, 25(1), 35-45.

REFERENCES
(Continued)

Martin, E. Some thoughts on mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 1974, Nov., 150-153.

Martin, E. Integration of the handicapped child into regular schools, Minnesota Education, 1976, 2, 5-7.

Mercer, C., Forgnone, C. and Beattie, J. Inservice and the large university: Perspectives, issues, and recommendations. Teacher Education & Special Education, 1978, 2, 32-34.

NEA Panel for the Study of Education of the Handicapped. Educationfor All Handicapped Children: Consensus, Conflict and Challenge. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1978.

Prehm, H. and McDonald, J. The yet to be served - A perspective. Exceptional Children, 1979, 45, 502-507.

Price, M. and Goodman, L. Individualized education programs: A cost study. Exceptional Children, March, 1980, 446-454.

Raison, S. Curriculum modification for special needs at the secondary level. Education Unlimited, 1979, 1 (3), 19-21.

Redden, M. and Blackhurst, E. Mainstreaming competency specifications for elementary teachers. Exceptional Children, May, 1978, 615-617.

Reynolds, M. A look to the future in teacher education. Teacher Education and Special Education, 1979, 2, 9-11.

Ryor, J. 94-142: The perspective of regular education. Learning Disabiity Quarterly, Spring, 1978, 6-14.

Stedman, D. Field based education: Grow some more or plow it under. Teacher Education and Special Education, 1979, 2, 45-49.

Waldron, K. Toward effective in-service delivery. The Pointer, 1980, 24 (3), 68-75.

Wieck, C. Training and development of staff: Lessons from business and industry. Education Unlimited, 1979, 1, 6-12.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Dr. Jasper Harvey, until his untimely death was Director, Division of Personnel Preparation, Office of Special Education, U. S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

Dr. William Schipper is Associate Director, National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Nevin Jones is Superintendent, Floyd County Public Schools, Georgia.

Ms. Carol Lewis, formerly Assistant Director, The National Council of States on Inservice Education, Washington, D.C. is Special Assistant to the Director, Office of Overseas Dependents, U. S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Helen Hartle is Project Coordinator, Inservice Education, New York State Department of Education, Albany, New York.

Dr. Philip H. Mann is Director, Teacher Corps Exceptional Child Component Demonstration Project, School of Continuing Studies, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida.

Dr. Catherine Morsink is Chairperson, Department of Special Education, University of Kentucky, Louisville, Kentucky.

Dr. Robert F. Moore is Associate Professor of Educational Psychology and Area Chairman, Exceptional Citizens Education Program University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida.

Ms. Patricia P. Kells, formerly Personnel Development Specialist, Kansas State Department of Education, Topeka, Kansas, has recently moved to the Department of Psychology, School of Education and Psychology, Emporia State University.

Dr. Stanley A. Fagen is Supervisor for Inservice Training, Office of Continuum Education, Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland.

NASBE PUBLICATIONS

Manual of State Policies Related to Adolescent Parenthood	$75.00
Overview of State Policies Related to Adolescent Parenthood	$12.50
Overview of State Policies Related to Adolescent Parenthood	$12.50
Suggested Services and Policies Related to Adolescent Parenthood	
An Administrator's Guide to Educating Gifted and Talented Children	$5.00
A Policymaker's Guide to Education for Gifted and Talented Children	$5.00
An Advocate's Guide to Building Support for Gifted and Talented Children	$6.00
CETA — Vocational Education Coordination	$10.00
Academic Credit for Work Experience in Maryland	$6.00
CETA — Education Collaboration in Three States	$5.00
Education Governance and Youth Employment Issues	$6.00
A Comprehensive Approach to Policymaking in Career Education	$3.00
CETA/YEDPA Education Policy Issues and Recommendations	$7.50
Career Education: A Compilation of State Board of Education Policies, Rules, Regulations and Statutes	$10.00
Statewide Educational Evaluation	$5.00
The Politics of Education	$5.00
Perspectives on Consumer Education, a series of three monographs: Program Content, Program Design, Topics and Issues	$7.50
Minimum Competency Testing: State-of-the-Art	$5.00
Vocational Education of Handicapped Youth: State-of-the-Art	$4.50